

M I L T O N 3

N O P L A G I A R Y ;

O R , A

1066. i. 25
4

DETECTION of the FORGERIES

CONTAINED IN

LAUDER'S ESSAY on the Imitation of the
Moderns in the PARADISE LOST.

IN A

LETTER humbly addressed to the Right
Honorable the EARL of BATH,

By the Rev. JOHN DOUGLAS, A.M.

THE SECOND EDITION,

Corrected, and enlarged, by the Addition of

A P O S T S C R I P T.

L O N D O N :

Printed for A. MILLAR, opposite Catherine-Street,
in the Strand. MDCCCLVI.

MILTON

NO. 1. PL. A. G. I. A. R. Y.

OF A

Detection of the Forgeries

CONTAINED IN

Landers's Essay on the History of the
Moderns in the Paradise Lost.



LETTER
to the Right
Honourable

By the Hon. J. A. M.

THE SECOND EDITION.

Corrected, and enlarged, by the Author of

A. P. O. S. T. S. C. R. I. P. T.

III

LONDON:

Printed by A. Mallett, at the Sign of the
in the Strand. MDCCLXIV.

A
L E T T E R,

To the Right Honorable

The EARL of BATH.

MY LORD,

GREAT Men are the Servants of the Public; and therefore I shall make no Apology for having laid your *Lordship* under a kind of Necessity of perusing this Letter, the Subject of which naturally led me to address it to one whose Abilities as a Statesman, altho' more generally known, as having been so long successfully exerted in Defence of *Public Liberty*, are not a more distinguished Part of his Character than is a *fine Taste*, and a masterly Acquaintance with *polite Literature*.

To whom can I address a Defence of *Milton* with such Propriety as to the avowed Patron of *Milton*? To whom should I inscribe

B

my

my Observations on an Attack made on the *Paradise Lost*, but to your *Lordship*, to whose Encouragement and Generosity the World is indebted for an Edition of that Poem—an Edition whose Splendor and Beauty do Honor to the *English* Press?

Your *Lordship* in vain retireth from public Business: For after the Storms of Party Rage are subsided, we follow you to the Shade—glad to court your Approbation, and to submit to your Judgment the Merits of a Controversy, which you, of all others, have the best Right to decide, if we consider the Subject of it, and which you, of all others, are best qualified to decide, if we consider your Abilities.

Some time after the Publication of Dr. *Newton's Milton*, a Book appeared under the Title of *an Essay on Milton's Use and Imitation of the Moderns in his Paradise Lost*; a Book written with an express Intention to depreciate *Milton's* poetic Abilities, and the Author of which pretendeth to have made such Discoveries, as ought to induce the World no longer to revere the Author of *Paradise Lost* as an exalted Genius, but to despise him as an *unlicensed Plagiary*. Your *Lordship* will there-

therefore, I flatter myself, indulge me while I make some Remarks on a Performance, which promiseth such mighty Matters, and which threateneth to strip our great Countryman of those Laurels that have so long been thought his Due.—It is not from any Ambition of commencing Author, that I have been induced to address myself to your Lordship in this public Manner; but from this one Motive, *that the World is ignorant of some Facts*, the Knowledge of which is necessary before we can enter into the Merits of the Controversy between *Milton* and his *Critic*. And as I have been so lucky as to come at the Knowledge of those Facts, I think myself obliged, in strict Justice, to make them public; encouraged by this Consideration, that as they are of a very extraordinary Nature, I have Reason to hope that your *Lordship* will overlook with Candor my unskilful Manner of representing them.

But before I mention to your *Lordship* what these Facts are, suffer me to premise a few general Observations, which may not be without their Use in the present Controversy.

The Reflexion that immediately occurred to me on perusing our Critic's *Essay* was this:

That he deserved the Thanks, and ought to meet with the Encouragement of the *Public*, as having been the first who discovered that *Milton* had, in the Composition of his *Paradise Lost*, been assisted by several *modern Authors*, whose Works, nay whose very Names, if once known, had long been sunk in Oblivion. His Imitations of the sacred Writers, of the ancient Poets, and of the modern *Italian* ones, have been often taken Notice of by those who have commented on him. But that he owed any Thing to *Masenius* the *Jesuit*, to *Taubmannus* a *German* Professor, or to *Staphorstius* a *Dutch* Divine, had 'till now escaped the Penetration, and eluded the Search of the Learned. This Discovery I thought to be the entire Property of Mr. *Lauder*; and a Discovery in any Branch of Literature, however trifling in itself, ought always, and generally doth do Honor to the Discoverer.

But however willing I was to do Justice to Mr. *Lauder's* Labors, yet was I far from thinking that he made any Discoveries which can be of such Efficacy, as to lessen that Tribute of Veneration so long paid to the Author of *Paradise Lost*. And if your *Lordship* will permit, I shall assign the Reasons for my
being

being of Opinion that the warmest Advocate for *Milton* may readily grant all that his *Zoilus* contendeth for, and yet be able to defend the Genius and poetic Talents of his *favorite Author* to Advantage; that he may grant that he did borrow, and yet shew that this ought not to detract from his *Fame*; in a Word, that he may allow the Truth of *Lauder's* Charge, and yet deny the Consequences that he seemeth to draw from it.

Our Critic chargeth *Milton* with having borrowed both the *Plan of his Poem*, and also *particular Sentiments*: Suppose the Charge made good—yet, will it follow that his Pretensions to Genius are disproved? The same Charge may be brought against *Virgil*, and it may be objected to his Claim to a distinguished Seat on *Parnassus*, that scarcely a Page of his *Æneid* can be instanced, where we do not meet with some Imitation of the *Iliad* or *Odyssey*. Do the Admirers of *Virgil* deny the Charge?—No: but think that their high Regard for his Poem, is perfectly consistent with their admitting that its Author borrowed Hints from *Homer*. And shall the Character of the *Englishman* be depreciated for doing what is thought no just Cause to detract

detract from the Fame of the *Roman*?— Scarcely an eminent Writer can be instanced who hath not been indebted to the Labors of former Authors; but how absurd would it be to urge this as an Argument that there is no Merit in their Productions? For as *one* may be what is called an *original Writer*, and yet have no Pretensions to *Genius*, so another may make use of the Labors of former Authors in such a Manner as to satisfy the World of his own Abilities. There may be such a thing as an *original Work* without *Invention*, and a Writer may be an Imitator of others without *Plagiarism*.

But as Authority will always weigh more than Assertion, and often more than Argument, I think I cannot take a more effectual Way to confirm and establish what I advance, than to bring up, as an Evidence, the great *Longinus*. What then is *his* Opinion? So far is he from thinking that Imitations of old Authors detract any thing from the Merit and Genius of those who have recourse to them, that, on the contrary, he expressly layeth down the Imitation and Emulation of the former great Writers and Poets, as one of the Ways that leadeth to the Sublime. This he particularly illustrateth by
the

the Example of *Plato*, who, he saith, imitated *Homer* more closely than *Herodotus*, *Stesichorus*, and *Archilochus* had done before, and drew from the copious Stream of that Poet, ten Thousand Rivulets to enrich his own Works. And this Proceeding, addeth he, *is not to be looked upon as PLAGIARISM, but* (as I find the Passage translated by Mr. Smith) *an Imitation of the finest Pieces, or copying out those bright Originals, in Methods consistent with the nicest Honor* *. And if *Longinus* be so far from looking upon *Imitation* to be *Plagiarism*, as to recommend it as one of the Sources of the Sublime, and to praise *Plato* for his Observation of this Rule, who will venture to assert that *Milton's* Imitations in his *Paradise Lost* detract any thing from the Merit of the Poem?

But it is not merely from Writers of the first Class, that an Author may convey Beauties into his own Work. Amidst unprofit-

* *ἰνδίκνυνται δ' ἡμῖν ἔτος ὁ ἀνὴρ (Plato) εἰ βουλοίμεθα μὴ καλῶν γυναικῶν, ὡς καὶ ἄλλη τις παρὰ τὰ εἰρημένα ὁδὸς ἐπὶ τὰ ὑψηλὰ τεύει. ποία δὲ καὶ τίς αὕτη; ἡ τῶν ἔμπροσθεν μεγάλων συγγραφέων καὶ ποιητῶν μίμησις τε καὶ ζήλῳσις.* — Μόνος Ἡρόδοτος Ὀμηρικῶς τάλως ἐγμένα; Στρεσίχωρος ἔτι ἀρτίτερον ὅ τε Ἀρχίλοχος, πάντων δὲ τούτων μάλιστα ὁ Πλάτων, ἀπὸ τοῦ Ὀμηρικοῦ ἐκίειν καμῶλος εἰς αὐτὸν μυρίας ὅσας παραλοπᾶς ἀποχλυσάμενος. — Ἐστὶ δ' ἡ κλεψὶς τοῦ πρᾶγμα, ἀλλ' (ὡς ἀπὸ καλῶν ἡδῶν) ἡ ἀλλασμάτων ἢ δημιουργημάτων ἀπολύτῳσις. *Longinus* περὶ ὑψους. Ed. Pearce: Page 51. 52.

able Weeds, the most fragrant Flower, the most valuable Plant, may spring up : And there may be in Productions destitute of Genius, something worthy of the Imitation of the most masterly Writer, something which he may convert to his own Use, by dragging it out of its Obscurity and transplanting it into a better Soil, where it may be improved itself, and where it may add fresh Beauty to a Scene already beautiful. A good Writer will exercise his Right to Imitation, in such a Manner as to convince every one, that his having Recourse to it, is not the Effect of Sterility of Fancy, but of *Solidity of Judgment*. He will borrow only to shew his own Talents in heightening, refining and polishing all that is furnished to him by others, and thereby secure his Character as a *fine Writer*, from being confounded with that of the *dull Copyer*. If his Touch convert base Metal into *Sterling Coin*; if from amidst indigested Heaps of Dulness he can extract the only shining Thought, the only striking Image ; if he can so change and new-model what he borroweth, as to add a Dignity of *Language* and Propriety of *Epithet* to Sentiments cloathed by their *Original Author* in the meanest Garb ;—if an Author borroweth in such a Manner, the Skill shewn in making

making so judicious an Use of the Labors of others, alloweth the Reader no Time to give them any Share of the Praise; and leadeth him to this Conclusion, that to make a prudent and skilful Imitation, to accommodate it so as to make it correspond exactly to the present Occasion—and to drop it when the Prosecution of it would commence improper, are Marks of Genius and Capacity, far from being contemptible.

The above Reflexions will, I think, sufficiently obviate the Consequences that *Lauder* seemeth to draw, to the Prejudice of *Milton's* poetic Merit, from his having imitated the Writers whose Names are now brought to Light, in some of the Sentiments, Similies, Speeches and Descriptions in the *Paradise Lost*. The other Part of the Charge—his having borrowed the *Plan of his Poem*, cometh next to be considered.

Now, my Lord, were we to admit the Truth of this Charge, yet still I see no Reason for making the wild Conclusion that *Milton's* Pretensions to Genius are overturned, or that his Critic can be warranted to call him, as he doth, an * *unlicensed Plagiary*.

* *Lauder's Essay*, Page 163.

Had he produced in any of his Authors a Poem where *Milton's Plan* of the *Paradise Lost* is sketched out so as to make a tolerable Likeness; had he shewn that the *English* Poet found the Edifice already built, and had no Merit but that of repairing and adorning it, then, indeed, I grant we should have had no Reason for looking upon him as endowed with any Superiority of Genius; we should scarcely have regarded him in any other Light but that of a Transcriber. But this our *Critic* hath not done; this he could not do. He is at the Pains to transcribe the Contents of *Masenius's* Poem, and the Marginal Notes, which give us a complete Idea of a Performance represented by him as the Ground-work of *Milton's Plan*.—Now whoever will take the Trouble to compare the Plan of the *Paradise Lost* with the Analysis of *Masenius* given us by *Lauder*, will scarcely find any other Resemblance but what unavoidably arose from Writing on the same Subject, and from having had the same Materials to work upon—the sacred Volumes.—And even our *Critic* himself, when he would instance the Particulars in which *Milton's Plan* is the same with *Masenius's*, can mention only the *infernal Council* or *Pandæmonium*, *Lucifer's Habit and Chariot*, the Fight

Fight of the Angels, with the Excursion of the fallen Spirits from Hell *. Let us admit then that *Milton* hath taken these Hints from *Ma-senius*, that he hath borrowed his *Death and Sin* from *John Fox* †, his angelic War from *Taubmannus* ‡, and other *Members and Episodes* of his *Paradise Lost* from others; yet while the Composition of the whole Plan, the Connection of the several Parts, and the Reference that they bear to each other are indisputably all his own, his Pretensions to *Genius* will remain unshaken. Invention is the principal Ingredient in our Idea of *Genius*; and that *Milton* was not deficient in Invention, but blest with an uncommon Strength of *Fancy* and Extent of *Imagination*, is obvious from the admirable Manner in which he hath disposed, ranged and united, so as to have a proper Place in his Plan, detached, incoherent Hints; and from his having so joined together the Materials which were supplied by his own *Fancy*, and those scattered without Order in the Writings of others, as, out of them, to form a regularly digested Plan, which, however some of the Members of it, separately considered, may be borrowed, is, as to the Composition of the *whole*, entirely new. An Architect who doth nothing but copy a

* *Lauder's Essay*, p. 22. † *D^o. p. 115.* ‡ *D^o. p. 136.*

Plan of an Edifice out of *Palladio*, giveth no Proof of his Skill; but if he hath united the Beauties of many Palaces erected by other Masters, so that they should all have a Place in *One*; in this Case we cannot refuse owning him as a skilful Architect, because his connecting together Beauties originally detached from each other, and his working them up into One uniform Design, is a Proof of his Capacity, and maketh the Plan to be an *Original, and his own*, altho' the separate Members of it *be Old, and borrowed*.

Thus, *my Lord*, if there be any Weight in the foregoing Reflexions, the Truth of the Charge brought against *Milton* by our *Critic*, and which he foolishly thought big with such mighty Consequences, will appear to detract little or nothing from the Merit of the *Paradise Lost*.

But if *Milton* hath been so much indebted to Mr. *Lauder's* Moderns, why doth he so industriously conceal it?—Admitting that he hath industriously concealed it, what will follow? It may bring him in guilty of *Dis- ingenuity*, but ought not to brand him with *Plagiarism*; it may lessen our Regard to the *Man*, but doth not destroy his Reputation

as a *Poet*.—But is there any Foundation for this Charge, that *Milton* hath industriously concealed his being assisted by others? Yes, saith our Critic*, *he has in the most express Terms, in the beginning of his Work, disclaimed all Manner of Assistance and Help in composing his Poem, by asserting that his Muse pursues*

Things unattempted yet in Prose or Rhime.

Now I should be extremely glad if Mr. *Lauder* would take the Trouble to prove that this Line of *Milton* implieth, what he would have us believe, a disclaiming of all Manner of Help and Assistance in composing the *Paradise Lost*. ---Let us keep to the strict, grammatical Sense of the Line, and it will appear that *Milton* might make this Boast without any Disingenuity, and without any Intention of deluding the World into a Belief that he was more of an *Original Writer* than he really is. For if there be so much as one Part of the Plan of *Paradise Lost*, if there be but one *Episode*, or even one Sentiment in that Poem, the Work of *Milton's* own Fancy (and even *Lauder* himself will not, I believe, deny that there are some Things *new* in the *Paradise Lost*) this intituled him to say that he sung *Things*

* *Lauder's Essay*, P. 74.

unattempted yet.—Had *Milton* asserted that his Subject was unattempted yet in Prose or Rhime, then indeed the Charge of Disingenuity might have had a Foundation. But there is a wide Difference between saying that he singeth *Things unattempted yet in Prose or Rhime*, and saying that the Subject of his Poem is entirely new, and had never been thought of before. The Subject of the *Paradise Lost* is as Old as the sacred Volumes; and therefore, if the Line in Question is to be understood as our Critic interpreteth it, *Milton*, by it, disclaimeth the Assistance of the Scriptures as much as he disclaimeth the Assistance of *Lauder's* obscure Moderns. But surely this could never enter into his Head; because whoever took the *Paradise Lost* into his Hands, could not but immediately perceive that it owed its Original to the Scriptures, and to the *Fall of Man* as there related.

Or were we even to allow that all the constituent Parts of *Milton's* Plan are borrowed (tho' this is far from being the Case) yet, even on this Supposition, his using of the Line objected to could be defended; he might, even then, have said, without any Impeachment of Truth, that he sung *Things unattempt-*
ed

ed yet in *Prose* or *Rhime*, because, as I have already observed, the Composition of the Plan of his Poem is all his own, and maketh it really an *Original Work*. A Phylician who by the judicious Junction and Mixture of several Drugs composeth a *Pill* or an *Electuary* of a sovereign Efficacy in certain Cases, would have Reason to complain of hard Treatment, if the World refused to look upon him as the *Original Inventor* of this Medicine, merely because the Ingredients that compose it were already of Use in Physic. The Composition of these Drugs, which, separately taken, could have been of no Use, into one, well-proportioned Mass that hath a sanative Virtue,—justly intitleth the Contriver of it to the Honor of being an Inventor—and it would be ridiculous to accuse him of Disingenuity for calling his Medicine entirely new. In the same Manner it is equally ridiculous to refuse to look upon the *Paradise Lost* as an *Original Poem*, merely because the unshapen Materials, out of which it was composed, lay ready for *Milton* to make use of.

Besides; *Milton's* Boast that he sung *Things unattempted yet in Prose or Rhime*, may be defended from this one Consideration, that he

was

was the first who ventured upon such a Subject in our Language,—and that no *English* Poet before him, had made *the Fall of Man* the Ground-work of an *Epic Poem*. Surely he had as good Pretensions to make this Boast, as *Lucretius* had to say

Avia Pieridum peragro loca, nullius ante
Trita solo *.

Lucretius had before him, when he composed his Poem, the Works of the greatest Masters of the *Atomic* and *Epicuræan* School, and all that is his own is the *new Dress* in which he hath cloathed the Sentiments of his Sect.

Virgil in his *Georgics* boasteth to the same Purpose

—me Parnassi deserta per ardua dulcis
Raptat amor: juvat ire jugis qua nulla priorum
Castaliam molli divertitur orbita clivo †.

Now, what other Foundation hath *Virgil* for this Boast but that he was the first of the *Latin* Poets who wrote on the Subject of *Agriculture*?—*Hesiod*, it is well known, had long before treated of the same Subject in Verse; and how much the *Roman* oweth to the *Greek* Bard, need not be confirmed by particular Instances.

* *Lucretius*, Book I. l. 925. † *Georgic* 3d.—291.

Horace,

But perhaps the Critic of the *Paradise Lost* thinketh it a Piece of Disingenuity that *Milton* did not expressly acquaint the World, what Authors he imitated or borrowed from, in composing of that Poem.—Now, I should imagine, that it were a sufficient Answer to this, to ask *Lauder*, whether it was not a Piece of Disingenuity in himself, that he did not expressly acquaint the World whose Assistance he had in composing his own *Essay*?—With regard to *Milton*, there was nothing ungenerous or criminal in his omitting to do this, because if he borrowed any thing from other Authors, these Authors were already in the Hands of the Public. The Books which a Man readeth, unavoidably give him a Turn of thinking correspondent to them, and the Sentiments he meeteth with there insensibly become his own ; so that in expressing his own Ideas, he naturally runneth into Imitations of his favorite Authors. But is it necessary that he should, upon every Occasion, tell his Readers, here I imitated *Plato*—there *Cicero* was of Use—this Sentiment was furnished to me by *Homer*—and that was borrowed from *Virgil*? This were a Work as endless as it is unnecessary, and what no Author ever hath executed. For it is one of the most capital Points labored by Com-

D 2

mentators,

mentators, to point out and discover those Passages of their Authors which have been imitated from the Works of others. *Virgil* hath imitated *Theocritus*, *Hesiod*, *Homer*, *Ennius*, *Lucretius*, and others very freely, but where did he ever expressly acquaint the World that he hath done this? Men of Learning, he knew, could find out the Passages imitated, and accordingly he left that Province to them.—In the same Manner, Part of *Milton's* Plan, and also particular Sentiments, to be met with in his *Paradise Lost*, have been borrowed from the Scriptures, from the ancient Poets, and, if Mr. *Lauder* will have it so, also from his Moderns. But was *Milton* under any Obligation to acquaint his Readers, when and where he was thus indebted to them? And can his not having done this be called an industrious Concealment of his Helps, be termed highly ungenerous, nay, criminal to the last Degree, and absolutely unworthy of any Man of common Probity and Honor *? None but our Critic could draw such Conclusions.—The pointing out of those Passages in the *Paradise Lost*, which *Milton* hath imitated from former Authors, hath been the Employment of his greatest Admirers—who,

* *Lauder*, Page 162—163.

thereby,

thereby, thought they only raised his Character the more, by the more displaying his Learning. Little did they dream that this their Labor could ever be urged as an Argument to depress the Merit of the Poem which they meant to recommend, or be so wrested as to lay Foundation for an Accusation of Disingenuity and Plagiarism against its Author.

And now, My Lord, having shewn that *Milton's* Boast, that he sung *Things unattempted yet in Prose or Rhime*, hath been, without any Reason, urged by his Critic, *as an industrious Concealment of his Helps*, and a *peremptory disclaiming of all Assistance*, suffer me to take Notice of the following strange and injudicious Assertions; “ That Mankind by
 “ giving too implicit a Faith to this bold
 “ Assertion of our Poet, that he sung *Things*
 “ *unattempted yet*, have been deluded into a
 “ false Opinion of *Milton's* being more an
 “ Original Author than any Poet ever was
 “ before him;—that this Opinion and this
 “ only has been the Cause of that infinite
 “ Tribute of Veneration that has been paid
 “ him these sixty Years past. Hence so many Editions, Translations, Commentaries,
 “ Lives,

“ Lives, Encomiums, Marble Busts, Pictures,
 “ Gold and Silver Medals *”.

Now, with what Shadow of Truth can the Critic of *Milton* assert, that the infinite Tribute of Veneration paid to him hath arisen from Men's Ignorance of his having been indebted to the Assistance of other Authors in the Composition of his Poem, when it is an indisputable Fact, that those very Persons who have done more than any body else to raise and extend his Reputation, have been the principal Discoverers of his Imitations? — Long before Mr. *Lauder* ever was heard of, the World knew that *Milton* had been indebted for the Ground-work of his Plan, and the principal Episodes of his Poem, to the Bible. And by turning to the late excellent Edition of our Poet, where we have all the Notes of his different Commentators, we shall see that it hath been, all along, their great Aim to trace their Author thro' the vast Compass of ancient and modern Learning, and to mark the Use which he hath made not only of the sacred but of the profane Writers — not only of the *Greek* and *Latin*, but also of the *Italian* and *English* Poets. Their Veneration for the *Paradise Lost* could not arise

* *Lauder*, Page 74.

from the Source that *Lauder* pretendeth, because the Helps and Assistance which, according to his own Account, *Milton* hath got from the obscure Moderns whom he quoteth, are a mere Trifle in Comparison of those which he hath drawn from more eminent Authors, and which had been before taken Notice of by *Hume*, *Addison*, *Bentley*, *Pearce*, *Newton*, *Thyer*, and others. — How weak, therefore, must not our Critic's Judgment be, who can imagine that it will sink the Merit of *Milton's* Poem, to acquaint the World that he copied his *Pandæmonium*, and two or three more Parts of his Plan from *Masenius*, when it did *not* sink the Merit of his Poem to know, as we did before, that far more important Parts of his Plan, nay indeed the principal Parts of it, were copied from the Scriptures? Or if we consider *Milton* as having imitated only the Sentiments, Similies and Descriptions of other Authors — have not his greatest Admirers pointed out vastly more of these Imitations than our Critic himself? By casting an Eye on the Notes in Dr. *Newton's Milton*, besides the frequent and close Imitations of Scripture, we shall find our Poet borrowing from *Homer*, *Sophocles*, *Euripides*, *Æschylus*, among the Greeks, from *Virgil*, *Horace*, *Lucan*, *Statius*,
Claudian

Claudian among the *Romans*, from *Tasso*, *Ariosto*, *Boiardo*, *Marino*, among the *Italians*, and from his own Countrymen *Fairfax*, *Spenser*, and *Shakespear*.—And will our Critic after this, have the Confidence to assert, that our not having known that *Milton* was indebted to *Masenius* for his Comparison of *Satan* to a Tower, to *Ramsay* for his Simile of the Serpent compared to a Ship, to *Taubmannus* for his Thought of ascribing the Invention of Fire-arms to the Devil, to *Grotius* for his comparing the Serpent's Eyes to Carbuncles; will he, I say, assert, that the World's being ignorant of this, till he brought it to Light, hath been the Cause that the *Paradise Lost* hath gained so much Veneration? And can he be so foolish as to flatter himself that these important Discoveries will make the World change it's Opinion?

The foregoing Reflexions, which I have offered to your Lordship's Consideration occurred to me on my first Perusal of the *Essay on Milton's Use and Imitation of the Moderns*; and upon a Supposition that the Author of it had made good his Charge, had really discovered to the World a new Set of Writers whose Works had furnished *Milton* with useful Hints in the Composition of his *Paradise Lost*.

Loft. It did not enter into my Head that our Critic could have the Effrontery to urge false Quotations in Support of his Charge; and therefore, I, as I imagine, did every other Person, into whose Hands his Book hath fallen, implicitly took it for granted, that the Authors whom he quoteth really contain those Lines which he attributeth to them, and some of which bear so striking a Resemblance to Passages in the *Paradise Loft*, that the Reader cannot avoid concluding with him that *Milton* had seen and imitated them.

— Will it not, therefore, be thought extremely strange, will it not excite the utmost Indignation in every candid Person's Breast, if the Reverse of this shall appear to be the Case — if it shall appear that our *conscientious Critic*, whose Notions of *Morality* taught him to accuse *Milton* of want of *common Probity or Honor* for having boasted that he sung *Things unattempted yet in Prose or Rhime*, hath, in order to be able to make good his Charge, had Recourse to *Forgeries* — Forgeries perhaps the grossest that were ever obtruded on the World?

My Residence during some Part of this last Summer, at a Place where Learning hath all the Assistances that good Libraries can af-

E

ford,

ford, and where (if any where in *England*) the Authors, from whom our Critic asserteth *Milton* to have borrowed, are to be found, gave me an Inclination to make a Search for them. Many of these are, indeed, so rare, that even that Place could not furnish me with them.—Not being so lucky, therefore, as to meet with a Copy of *Masenius* or of *Grotius's Adamus Exsul*, my next Search was for *Staphorstius* a *Dutch* Poet and Divine, who wrote a congratulatory Poem which he call-eth *Triumphus Pacis* on the Conclusion of the Peace betwixt the States of *Holland* and the Common-wealth of *England* in 1655. “This
 “ honest *Dutchman* (saith *Lauder*) to be sure
 “ never dreamt that the Prince of *English*
 “ Poets wou'd condescend to plume himself
 “ so liberally with his Feathers : But it was
 “ *Milton's* Custom to make all Authors tri-
 “ butary to him whom he read, to recom-
 “ pense, I presume, his Trouble in perusing
 “ them, and to fancy that his bare Accep-
 “ tance of their Mite of Assistance, was Re-
 “ ward sufficient, without the Formality of
 “ a public Acknowledgment *.”

You see, my Lord, from this Quotation, the ill-natured Pleasure that our Critic feel-

* *Lauder*, p. 102, 103.

eth in insulting over the Character of our Countryman. Let us, therefore, examine those Instances which are urged as Proofs that *Milton* hath plumed himself with the Feathers of *Staphorsius*.

Lauder's first Charge †, that *Milton* oweth this Passage

What in me is dark
Illumine! what is low raise and support!

to the following Lines of *Staphorsius*,

O charitis lux alma tuæ nebulosa medullæ
Antra meæ, Stygiis in sese obducta tenebris,
Illustret! primæq; micet radiosâ nitore!

is so trifling, and the Resemblance between the two Authors is, here, so distant, that it doth not merit our Attention; and therefore, I shall proceed to consider how justly the *English* Poet hath been represented as having been indebted for his Panegyric on Marriage to the *Dutchman*.

In Support of this Charge, our Critic quoteth † Thirty two Lines as from *Staphorsius's* Poem, a Copy of which I was so lucky as to meet with, printed at *Dort* 1655. Being resolved, therefore, to collate this Quotation with the printed Edition from which

* *Lauder*, p. 102, 103. † *Lauder*, p. 104, 105.

it is pretended to be taken, after I got the Book into my Hand I was absolutely at a Loss where to turn for the Lines in Question. Had *Lauder* been a fair Writer, had he been desirous of trusting the Merits of his Cause to every one's Inspection and Judgment, he would certainly have told his Readers in what Part of his Author's Works the Quotations that he maketh are to be found; he would have marked the Page where they are to be met with, and have mentioned other Particulars which would have rendered it easy for one, who had Inclination, to find the Passages quoted, in the original Authors. But it is remarkable that, thro' his whole Book, he omitteth to do this. Conscious, no doubt, of the Unfairness of his Quotations, he hoped to ward off a Detection by distracting the Examiner where to search.—This blind Way of quoting laid me under a Necessity of turning over an entire Volume, and of examining every Page, in order to find the Lines that are mentioned by our Critic as the Source of *Milton's* Sentiments on Marriage. — At last I found them*: But observed a vast Difference between *Lauder's* Quotation, and the Edition printed at *Dort*, which that you may be sensible of, I shall

* *Staphorstius*, Book 2d. p. 81.

transcribe the Passage in Question as it really standeth in *Staphorstius*.

Fœdus in humanis fragili quod sanctius ævo
 Firmius et melius, quod magnificentius ac quam
 Conjugii, sponsi, sponsæque jugalia sacra?
 Quæ sincera fides dextrâ haud secus atque sigillo
 Tam cupide firmatur ovans, & quæ fruitur tot
 Signis ac precibus, tot habens patresque, ducesque
 Ac desponsa fides, servatrix firma decori
 Connubii? Deus est summus Pater ejus & auctor.
 { Subsignant chari qui ipsos genuere Parentes,
 Dulciter & reliqui tunc suffragantur amici,
 Publicitus thalami confirmat Ecclesia fœdus
 Addunturque preces, fit conclamatio vulgi;
 Fœmina sic & mas thalamum sociantur in unum
 Ipsos vota decent eadem, mens una salubris:
 Ut veluti natura monet quod consulit æquum,
 Quod concinna rogans ratio validissima suadet.
 Sic sit sancta Venus stabilis, sint vincula amoris
 Candida & obdurent cunctos sacrosancta per annos.
 { Quærere debet enim mulier nil citra maritum
 Quærere sic nullam debet mas ultra maritam.
 Membra fides thalami servare reciproca mandat.
 Omnis in hoc ævo ipsorum concessa voluptas
 Conjugis in gremio tantum solidatur in uno;
 Ut penes alterutrum sit corporis una potestas:
 { Corporis unde sui non est mas tuor at uxor
 Corporis atque sui domina est non fœmina sed vir.
 Hoc tam magnificum, tam sanctum, tam solidumque
 Percellens animos splendore, tot unde potentes
 Heroas, tantosque duces prodire caballo
 Trojano velui, certum est, hominumque propago
 Tota decet manare pudens: omnisque potestas
 In terris ex hac divinâ Stirpe resultat.

Now if any one will but take the Trouble
 to compare the above Lines which are faith-
 fully transcribed from *Staphorstius*, with
 those

those which the Critic of *Milton* quoteth as his, a very remarkable Difference will appear at first Sight. He will observe several Lines omitted which I have restored to their Place, and distinguished by including them in Parentheses; and not only this, but he will be surprized to find eight Lines quoted as from *Staphorstius*, which have no Existence in that Author.

In the Room of *Quærere debet enim mulier nil citra Maritum*, and the following equally wretched Line, *Lauder* hath thought proper to insert,

Auspice te, fugiens alieni succuba lecti
 Dira libido Hominum totâ de gente repulsa est,
 Ac tantum gregibus pecudum ratione carentum
 Imperat, & sine lege tori furibunda vagatur.
 Auspice te, quam jura probant, rectumque piumque
 Filius atque pater, fraterque innotuit, & quot
 Vincula vicini sociarunt sanguinis, a te
 Nominibus didicere suam distinguere gentem.

These eight Lines our Critic hath distinguished from the rest of the Quotation, by printing them in *Italics*, as having the most striking Resemblance to the Panegyric on Marriage in the *Paradise Lost*. As to the rest of the Quotation from *Staphorstius*, I appeal to every one whether he can find the least most distant Agreement between it and
 any

any of *Milton's* Sentiments on the same Subject. So that the Merits of the Controversy are confined to the last quoted Eight Lines, and *Milton's* being indebted for his Sentiments on Marriage to *Staphorstius*, resteth upon his having imitated *them*.

And, indeed, if these Lines be really in *Staphorstius*, I will allow that the Critic of *Milton* hath made good his Charge, because the following ones from the *Paradise Lost* bear the strongest Resemblance to them that can be.

By thee, adulterous Lust was driven from Men
Among the bestial Herd to range ; by thee
Founded in Nature loyal, just and pure,
Relations dear and all the Charities
Of Father, Son and Brother first were known *.

Here, then I join Issue with Mr. *Lauder*, and allow that the Eight *Latin* Lines, and the Five *English* ones of *Milton*, just quoted, are so much alike, that he who wrote the one, had the other before him : But, I absolutely deny that the *English* are the Copy.

For thus, *my Lord*, standeth the Case. The Critic of *Milton* quoteth eight Lines as from *Staphorstius*, but upon turning to the

* *Paradise Lost*, B. 4. l. 753.

printed Copy of that Author, no such Lines are there to be met with. Will he endeavor to save himself by saying that the Edition that he made use of hath these Lines, tho' the Edition that I collated hath them not?—All Evasion of this kind is precluded, because the Description which he giveth of *his* Edition † of *Staphorstius* proveth it to be the same to which I appeal, and which every one may see in the *Bodleian* Library.—It is impossible, therefore, for him to clear himself from this Charge which I now bring against him—*Of having corrupted the Text of STAPHORSTIUS by interpolating Eight Lines not to be found there; which Eight Lines are the only ones on which he could found his Charge against Milton, of having imitated the Dutchman's Panegyric on Marriage.*

But tho' what hath been already observed, putteth it beyond all doubt that the Critic of *Milton* hath interpolated the Eight Lines in Question into the Text of *Staphorstius*, yet, for your *Lordship's* farther Satisfaction, it may not be improper to mention from whence *Lauder* hath got them. If I omit doing this, Room would be left for imagining that he himself hath translated them

† See *Lauder's* Dates of his Authors.

from those of *Milton* already quoted. But this is not the Case: The Lines are good ones, and, therefore, let us give the Honor of them to their real Author.

In order, then, to open the Sources from which our Critic hath derived many of his Quotations which bear so striking a Resemblance to Passages in the *Paradise Lost*, I must take Notice that so long ago as the Year 1690, there was printed at *London*, a *Latin* Translation of the *Paradise Lost and Regained*, and of the *Samson Agonistes*, by one *Hogæus*, as he calleth himself in the Title Page, — * *Hog*, I suppose, if we strip the Name of the *Latin* Termination. This Book seemeth to be of mighty Use to our honest Critic. Being in Possession of a Copy of it, he hath begun, in Time, to imagine that *his* was the only Copy; and, therefore, being resolved to do what was in his Power, to lessen that *Tribute of Veneration* paid to *Milton*, he thought he could not take a more effectual Way to fix the odious Character of an *unlicensed Plagiary* upon him, than by inserting into the Authors from whom he pre-

* *William Hog*, a *Scotsman*. Besides his Translation of the *Paradise Lost and Regained*, and of the *Samson Agonistes*, he hath left several other *Latin* Poems—particularly a Paraphrase of the Book of *Job*, printed at *London* 1682.

tendeth that *Milton* hath borrowed, Lines from *Hog*, and which could not but bear a striking Resemblance to Lines in the *Paradise Lost*, being indeed nothing more nor less than Translations of them.

That I have sufficient Grounds for asserting what appeareth so extraordinary, *your Lordship* will readily admit when I inform you, that I have actually in my Possession at present this very Translation of the *Paradise Lost* by *Hog*; and upon turning to the fourth Book *, where he translateth the famous Panegyric on Marriage, *I find, without the Variation of a single Word, the eight Lines inserted by LAUDER into the Text of Staphorstius*. Had I not seen this, were it not in every Body's Power to see it, by turning to the Book, I should not have ventured to assert a Fact so extremely improbable. — I should have thought it impossible that the vilifying of a Person's Character now so long dead, could be a Matter of such Moment, as that all the Rules of *common Probity and Honor* are to be trampled under Foot, rather than not have wherewithal to support an Accusation. It must certainly be thought extremely hard that *Milton* should be run

* *Hog*, p. 112.

down as a Plagiary, for having stolen from himself. And yet this is exactly the Case: *Hog* tranſlateth the *Paradiſe Loſt* into *Latin*; *Lauder* inferteth ſome of *Hog's* Lines into *Staphorſtius*, and then urgeth theſe very Lines as a Demonſtration that *Milton* copied him.

And now, *my Lord*, is not this ſingle Inſtance of Forgery, ſo extraordinary in all its Circumſtances, and ſo unexceptionably proved, enough to blaſt our Critic's Credit in all his other Quotations?—It certainly is. However let us follow him in one or two more, and we ſhall have accumulated Proofs of his *impudent Forgeries*.

In the fifth Book of the *Paradiſe Loſt* we have the Morning Hymn, ſung by *Adam* and *Eve*, and which beginneth thus,

“ Theſe are thy glorious Works, Parent of Good !

This Hymn, one of the greateſt Ornaments of the Poem, is, as Dr. *Newton* juſtly obſerveth, “ an Imitation, or rather a Sort
“ of Paraphraſe, of the 148th Pfalm, and
“ (of what is a Paraphraſe upon that) the
“ Canticle placed after *Te Deum* in the Liturgy, *O all ye Works of the Lord, bleſs ye*
“ *the Lord, &c.* which is the Song of the

“ three Children in the Apocrypha*.” *Lauder*, however, imagining perhaps, that it would be a greater Reflection on *Milton’s* Character as a Poet to convict him of imitating *Staphorstius*, than it would be to convict him of imitating the *Psalmist*, telleth us — “ that he cannot help thinking but “ that *Milton* has borrowed from this Author (*Staphorstius*) a great Part of the “ noble Hymn sung by *Adam* and *Eve* †”.

In support of this Charge he quoteth Thirty-three Lines from his *Dutchman*. But as it would swell this Letter to an immoderate Length, were I to insert Quotations unnecessarily, I shall, therefore, refer to Mr. *Lauder’s* Book for the Quotation in question which beginneth thus,

Cœlestes animæ ! sublimia templa tenentes,

And endeth thus,

Collustrat terras dum lumine Titan Eoo §

Now tho’ our Critic cannot help thinking *Milton’s* Morning Hymn copied from the Lines of *Staphorstius*, last referred to, yet am I perswaded that, upon comparing them,

* Dr. *Newton’s* Note on the 153 Line of the 5th Book.

† *Lauder*, p. 108. § D^o. p. 109—110.

every impartial Person will think he hath Reason to conclude, that, tho' there be some Resemblance of Sentiment; yet this is no Proof that *Milton* ever saw *Staphorstius*; because this Resemblance hath arisen, from their both having had before them, the *Psalm* and *Church Hymn* already mentioned.

But there are two Lines in the Quotation that *Lauder* giveth us from *Staphorstius*, which he perhaps thinketh are a Proof that *Milton* imitated in this Place the *Dutch Poet* and not the inspired *Psalmist*. And indeed there is a very striking Resemblance between them, and two Lines in the Morning Hymn of the *Paradise Lost*.—*Milton*, having called upon every Part of inanimate Nature to praise the Lord, addeth

Witness, if I be silent Even or Morn.

Now there is a Line in our Critic's Quotation from *Staphorstius* very like this; it is as followeth,

Aurorâ, redeunte novâ, redeuntibus umbris.

Again, *Milton* hath the followine Line,

Him first, him last, him midst and without End;

And

And it is scarcely possible to translate this Line more literally than in the following Words which are also quoted as from *Staphorstius*,

Te primum, & medium, & summum, sed sine carentem.

Here, then, again our Critic thinketh that he hath Reason to triumph over *Milton*, as *pluming himself with the Feathers of Staphorstius*; and every one who taketh it for granted that these two Lines, especially the last, are in the *Dutchman's Works*, will very readily admit the Truth of the Charge. But, indeed, they are no more in *Staphorstius* than are the Eight Lines of which we have already taken Notice. For upon collating *Lauder's* Quotation with the *Dort* Edition, I found that they were both wanting, as is also another Line quoted by him from this Author,

O miris mirande modis, ter maxime rerum;

They are wanting in the very Edition which, as I observed before, he telleth us he used, and therefore, that he hath interpolated them to create a Resemblance between *Milton* and *Staphorstius*, which had no Existence before, is evident beyond all Dispute. And certainly

tainly he could not take a more effectual Way to prove this Resemblance, than by inserting into *Staphorstius*, as he had done in another Place, *Hog's* Translation of those very Lines, which he pretendeth that *Milton* hath stolen. Upon examining *Hog's* Translation of the *Morning Hymn*, I found the Lines in question to have a Place there*. —It seemeth to be so extremely improbable, that any one should ever venture to put so gross an Imposition on the World, that, as I observed before, I almost despair of being believed, altho' *I know* the certainty of the Fact.

I shall only add on this Head, in order to expose more, the unfair Manner in which *Lauder* giveth us Quotations from his Authors, resembling Passages of the *Paradise Lost*, that he not only thinketh himself at Liberty to insert what was not in their Text, but also to leave out what is really there. An Instance of this I gave in the first Quo-

* *Hog*, p. 128 — 130. *Lauder* in order to accommodate *Hog's* Translation of the Line, *Him first, him last*, &c. to the Context of *Staphorstius* in this Place, was obliged to display his Skill in altering the Text of his Authors by changing *Hanc* into *Te*. For the Line in *Hog* runs thus

Hunc primum, hunc medium, hunc summum, sed sine carentem.

tation from *Staphorstius*, where I included, in Parentheses, eight Lines omitted by the Critic.—And we find him in this last Quotation doing the same Thing, and leaving out eight Lines again, which ought to have a Place after the Sixth Line of his Quotation, and are as followeth,

Servator rerumque opifex, tu patris imago
 O indute meos artus cum sanguine lympham
 Reddebas moriens, venturæ pignora vitæ,
 Et totum rupto fundebas corpore amorem :
 Vulneribus tergum effossum flagrisque cruentum
 Monstrasti patrique tuo nostroque, favorem
 Ejus concilians nobis : hinc fœdera pacis
 Ad terras venere meas ; Bellona fugata est.

It will not be a sufficient Excuse for *Lauder* to allege that he omitted these Lines merely from a Conviction that *Milton* had made no Use of them.—When we look to his Quotation from *Staphorstius*, we shall be apt to conclude, that immediately after the Line

Magna dei soboles ! agne inculpate Jehovæ

Followed

Omnia in illustri lucentia fidera cœli,

and yet if we turn to the Original, we find that no less than eight Lines intervene. Had the Critic of the *Paradise Lost* been a fair Writer,

Writer, when he chose to omit any Lines, as not to his Purpose, he would not have imposed upon his Readers, by presenting them with a Connection which is not in his Author. He would expressly, or, at least, by significant Marks, have instructed us, that he had omitted some intervening Lines.

—*Milton* hath but very foul Play, if the Text of the Authors from whom he is supposed to borrow must be cut and mangled before a Resemblance can be made out, and which could never have been made out but by joining together two distant Periods.

Having dispatched *Staphorstius*, let me now give your Lordship a Specimen of *Lauder's* Treatment of *Taubmannus*. He presenteth us with four or five Quotations from this *German*, which, from a Similitude of Sentiment in some Passages of the *Paradise Lost*, he would have us believe that *Milton* hath seen and copied. Tho', as it is extremely natural for two Authors writing on the same Subject, to have the same Sentiments, nay to express them by using similar Images, that *Milton* and *Taubmannus* do resemble each other in the Passages quoted, will not be thought by candid Inquirers, any Proof that this Resemblance is the Consequence of an

Imitation, rather than of *Accident*.—I shall, therefore, take particular Notice only of one of the Quotations from *Taubmannus*, where we shall again find our Critic at the honest Employment of *Forgery*: It will not be improper to set down the Lines as I find them quoted by him *.

Tunc, ait, imperio regere omnia solus? & una
 Filius iste tuus, qui se tibi subjicit ultro,
 Ac genibus minor ad terram prostrernit, & offert
 Nescio quos toties animi servilis honores?
 Et tamen æterni proles æterna Jéhovæ
 Audit ab æthereâ lateâque propagine mundi.
 { Scilicet hunc natum dixisti cuncta regentem, }
 { Cœlitibus regem cunctis, dominumque supremum. }
 Huic ego sim supplex? ego? quo prestantior alter
 Non agit in superis. Mihi jus dabit ille, suum qui
 Dat caput alterius sub jus & vincula legum?
 Semideus reget ille polos? reget avia terræ?
 Me pressum leviori manu fortuna tenebit?
 [Et cogar æternum duplici servire tyranno?]
 Haud ita. Tu solus non polles fortibus ausis.
 Non ego sic cecidi nec sic mea fata premuntur,
 Ut nequeam relevare caput; colloque superbum
 Excutere imperium. Mihi si mea dextra savebit
 Audeo totius mihi jus promittere mundi.

Now, my Lord, upon collating this Quotation with an Edition of *Taubmannus* †, I found three Lines wanting in the printed Copy, which *Lauder* giveth us as his Author's, and which I have distinguished by

* *Lauder*, p. 132.

† The Lines are in *Taubmannus*, *Bellum Angelicum*, Book I. Page 79.

the Parentheses, as above. I cannot be positive whether the Edition that I consulted answereth fully to the Description given by our Critic of *his*, which he telleth us was printed at *Leipſig* 1604. For tho' *Leipſig* be also on the Title-page of the Copy that I saw, yet, if I rightly recollect, the Year is not expressed. However, supposing the Editions to be different, it is extremely improbable that there should be so great a Variation between them. And, therefore, as I have met with an Edition (which every one may see, as it is in the *Bodleian* Library) that hath not the three Lines in question, there is a strong Suspicion that *Lauder* cannot produce an Edition in which they exist.

One of these Lines which are wanting in the *Leipſig* Edition of *Taubmannus*, our Critic hath taken Care to have printed in *Italics*; for the same Reason, I suppose, why he distinguished, in like Manner, *Hog's* eight Lines inserted into *Staphorstius*. The Line is

Et cogar æternum duplici servire tyranno?

and it beareth some Resemblance, tho' a distant one, to the following Passage of *Milton*,

Prostration vile!

Too much to one! but double, how endur'd*.

* *Paradise Lost*, Book 5. l. 782.

But I find nothing, in the other two Lines which he hath interpolated into *Taubmannus's* Text, or indeed in any part of the whole Quotation, that resembleth any thing that can be produced from the *Paradise Lost*, so much as to persuade us that *Milton* imitated the *German* in this Place. *Lauder* indeed giveth us * two different Passages from our Poet, which he will have to be borrowed from the above Quotation of *Taubmannus*. But upon comparing them together, the only Sentiment common to both Poets is *Satan's* Displeasure at the Power and Honor vested in the Son of G O D; and this Sentiment, which occurred so naturally on this Subject, is expressed in Words and Images very different. — I am therefore, at a Loss to conceive what could tempt our Critic to make an Interpolation that could so little serve his Cause: However, it seemeth, he thought it might be of Use, and it is enough that I detect his Forgeries, without troubling myself whether or no he hath forged with Judgment.—If it be asked whether *Hog* lent his Assistance also here, my Answer is, that there seemed so little Resemblance between any thing that can be produced from the *Paradise Lost* and this Quotation from *Taubman-*

* *Lauder*, p. 131.

nus, even supposing the three interpolated Lines had also been *bis*, that I did not think it worth while to trace *Lauder's* Steps minutely in this Place. I shall only observe, that one Circumstance giveth me Reason to think that the interpolated Lines, at least one of them, is not *Hog's*, but our Critic's own——and this is——that there is a false Quantity in the Word *Cogar*. Which Blunder, it is probable, is not so much the Effect of Ignorance, as of Design—the *German* Poet to whom this Line is attributed not being very scrupulous about these Matters, but frequently making such Mistakes.

The Imitations which the Critic of *Paradise Lost* pretendeth its Author hath made from *Quintianus's* Tragedies, from *Theodorus Beza's Abrahamus Sacrificans*, from *Daniel Heinfius's Herodes Infanticida*, and other Writers, are so trifling, and the Resemblance which he findeth, is often so distant, that even supposing that he hath quoted his Authors fairly, he will be still far enough from convincing the World that *Milton* ever saw them. That he hath quoted them fairly I could not satisfy myself, not having been able to meet with them after a strict Search. Tho', I think myself sufficiently well warranted to suppose,

suppose, that had the Library which I examined, furnished me with these Authors, I should have found the same extraordinary Licenses used in adapting their Text to the *Paradise Lost*, as we know have been taken with regard to *Stapherfius* and *Taubmannus*. *Carolus Malapertius*, another of *Milton's* supposed Creditors, I did collate with one Quotation from him given us by *Lauder*, from which he would have us believe *Milton* copied his Comparison of *Eve* to *Pandora*. But what Proof is there that *Milton* stole this Thought from the *Jesuit*, when it is so obvious that it could scarcely be avoided by one acquainted with the Heathen *Mythology*? Besides, it is impossible to express the same Comparison in Words, and in a Manner more different, than it hath been expressed by *Milton* and *Malapertius*. To satisfy your Lordship of this, I shall beg leave to quote them both. — *Malapertius's* Lines are as followeth,

Creduli quondam vitio mariti
 Fœminæ ad fraudes patuisse narrant
 Pyxidem ærumnis gravidam, malisque;
 Inde morborum incubuisse terris
 Agmen, & totum tenuisse mundum:
 Hæc fide vates memorent *Pelasga*
 Et coli ad lumen celebrent aniles.
Eva Pandoram facit innocentem
 Et capi blandæ facilis maritæ
 Uxorius *Adam*.

Now,

Now, will any one besides our Critic affirm that from the above Lines of the *Jesuit's Sedechias*, *Milton* borrowed the following ones?

What Day the genial Angel to our Sire
Brought her in naked Beauty more adorn'd
More lovely than *Pandora*, whom the Gods
Endow'd with all their Gifts (and O too like
In sad Event) when to th' unwiser Son
Of *Japhet*, brought by *Hermes*, she insnar'd
Mankind with her fair Looks, to be reveng'd
On him who had stole *Jove's* authentic Fire *.

I shall only add that *Lauder* had before † charged *Milton* with having stolen the same Comparison from *Masenius*. A Proof this, that he was resolved to support his Accusation even at the Expence of contradicting himself.—In the same Manner, at ‡ one Time he telleth us, that the 11th and 12th Books of the *Paradise Lost* are a Copy of *Rosse's Virgilius Evangelizans*; in § another Place he admitteth *Du Bartas* to a Share of this Honor; and in a || third, *Barlæus* is said to give us “ the *prima Stamina* of the “ best Part of the two last Books of the *Paradise Lost*.” Such seeming Contradictions I know not how our Critic can reconcile.

* *Paradise Lost*, B. 4. l. 712.

† *Lauder*, p. 44. ‡ *Lauder*, p. 62. § *Lauder*, p. 95.

|| *Lauder*, p. 114.

Let

Let him, if he can—while I proceed to give *your Lordship* a very odd Instance of his shameful Impositions on the World.

“From *Heywood's Hierarchia Angelica* (saith he) *Milton* hath borrowed this Verse which so often occurreth in his Poem

Thrones, Dominations, Princedoms, Virtues, Powers.

“*Heywood's Latin* in a beautiful Frontispiece is,

Throni, Dominationes, Principatus, Virtutes, Potestates,

“which no School-Boy could translate more literally *.”

Tho' our Critic had some Reason to hope that he might play his Tricks with the Text of *Stapborstius* and *Taubmannus*, without being detected, yet he must have arrived at a strange Pitch of Folly, otherwise he never would have made any Attempts on a Book that may be met with on almost every Stall in our Streets. Nothing is more certain than that there is no such Line in this *beautiful Frontispiece* of *Heywood*, as it is termed by our Critic. *Heywood*, on a Copper-Plate, giveth us a Sort of Plan of the System of the Heaven-

* *Lauder*, p. 152.

by *Hof*. In the Center is represented the blessed Trinity under the Form of a Triangle, and all round in a Circle, are the Nine different *Orders* of the Heavenly Inhabitants (for the School Divines thought that they could find so many Orders or Ranks of them mentioned in Scripture) each of which, besides its pictured Representation, hath its Name written at full Length; and if we follow *Heywood's* own Method, who divideth his Work into Nine Books, and assigneth One Book to each *Order*, we must read them in the following Manner, beginning with the *Order* which he treateth of in his first Book: *Seraphim, Cherubim, Throni, Potestates, Virtutes, Angeli, Archangeli, Principatus, Dominationes*—How, then, can *Lauder* have the Assurance to assert that no School-Boy could translate what is in *Heywood's* Frontispiece * more literally than the Author of *Paradise Lost* hath done in his Line, *Thrones, Dominations, Princedoms, Virtues, Powers*? The literal Translation of this Line is *Throni, Dominationes, Principatus, Virtutes, Potestates*; and any one who only readeth *Lauder*, but

* A similar Frontispiece is to be met with in a whimsical Book called *Theophila's Love Sacrifice*, by *Edw. Benlowes, Esq.* printed in 1652, which I suppose would also have been brought in Evidence against *Milton*, had our Critic been so lucky as to have seen it.

never examined *Haywood*, would naturally imagine that such a Line is on *Heywood's* Title Page, the Falsity of which is notorious from what I have observed. These Words may, indeed, be picked out of several others that are there, and, by being put into a quite different Order, will make out the very Line that *Lauder* quoteth, who seemeth to have adopted *Peter's* Method of interpreting his Father's Will *, and will be an excellent Hand to extract Blasphemy from the *Bible*, and Treason from the *Act of Settlement*.

Suffer me only to add on this Head, that the Critic of *Milton* needed not to have given himself the Trouble to torture and mangle *Heywood's* Frontispiece, to prove that the Line of the *Paradise Lost*, in question, was translated from it. For had he looked into his New Testament he would have found a Text which indisputably was the Source of *Milton's*

Thrones, Dominations, Virtues, Princedoms, Powers ;
he would have found the following Words,
ἢτε θρόνοι, ἢτε Κυριότητες, ἢτε ἀρχαὶ, ἢτε ἐξουσίαι †,
which are translated by the Vulgate, *five*
Throni, *five* *Dominiones*, *five* *Principatus*,

* See the Tale of a Tub. † *Coloss.* Chap. i. v. 16.

five Potestates. Milton's Line is a literal Translation of this Text, with this Difference only, that he hath one Word more, *Virtues*. And we need not be at a Loss whence he got it; for the Word *δυνάμεις* occurreth in three other Texts *, and is translated always by the Vulgate, *Virtutes*.——

Whatever Mr. *Lauder* may think, *Milton's* having borrowed the disputed Line will never detract any thing from his Merit as a Poet; and therefore, tho' I have shewn that he hath been falsely accused of having translated it from *Heywood's* Frontispiece, yet I have not hesitated to acknowledge that he had it from *St. Paul*.

I intended to have rested the Merits of my Cause on the Facts already mentioned, but my Stock of Materials having been, *very lately*, considerably augmented †, I have it
now

* *Neque Angeli, neque Principatus, neque Virtutes. Rom. viii. 38. Supra omnem Principatum, Potestatem & Virtutem, & Dominationem. Eph. i. 21. Subjectis sibi Angelis, & Potestatibus & Virtutibus. 1 Pet. iii. 22. These three Texts, that in the Epistle to the Colossians already mentioned, and these Places of Scripture where mention is made of Archangels, Seraphim, and Cherubim, have furnished the School Divines with the Nine Orders of the Heavenly Hierarchy, the Subject of many Books before Heywood's.*

† By Mr. *Bowle*, M. A. of *Oriel College, Oxford*; who, tho' I have not the Pleasure of his Acquaintance, hath been so
H 2 kind

now in my Power to enlarge the Catalogue of *Lauder's* Forgeries, and to point out to *your Lordship* such gross Interpolations in the Text of Authors not yet taken Notice of, as must, while they encrease our Resentment at the Impudence of our Critic's Attempt, at the same Time satisfy us that his Scheme of Fraud is more complicated and extensive than one could well imagine.

Phineas Fletcher, Fellow of *King's College, Cambridge*, is the Author of a *Latin Poem* against the *Jesuits*, entitled, *Locustæ vel Pietas Jesuitica*. From this Poem *Lauder* quoteth * fourteen Lines ; the two last of which are as followeth,

In promptu causa est : superest invicta voluntas
Immortale odium, vindictæ & sæva cupido.

When your Lordship compareth these two Lines with the following ones of *Milton*,

———What tho' the Field be lost
All is not lost ; th' unconquerable Will
And Study of Revenge, immortal Hate †,

kind as to communicate to me, by the Hands of a Friend, what he knoweth relative to *Lauder's* Forgeries. And nobody knoweth so much as this Gentleman, who, long before I examined the *Bodleian Library*, had collected Materials for an Answer to *Lauder*, and hath the justest Claim to the Honor of being the *Original Detector* of this ungenerous Critic. I thought this Acknowledgement due from me to Mr. *Bowle*, who will, also, I flatter myself, have the Thanks of the Public.

* *Lauder's* Essay, p. 124. † *Paradise Lost*, B. 1.—105.

it will be impossible to avoid being struck with the Resemblance; and as *Fletcher* wrote long before *Milton*, *Lauder's* Charge that *the former has been plundered by the latter*, will seem extremely well supported. But what if *Fletcher* hath no such Lines as the *two* above quoted?—That this is really the Case, and that our Critic hath interpolated them, in order to make out a Similitude between *Fletcher* and *Milton*, which otherwise could have had no Existence, will appear from the following Fact.

In *Lauder's* Quotation the two Lines in Question are supposed to follow immediately after this,

Et Stygiis mutet radiantia lumina flammis.

Now, upon turning to an Edition of the *Locustæ*, printed at *Cambridge* by *Thomas* and *John Bucke*, in Qto. 1627, the two Lines that bear so striking a Resemblance to those of *Milton* are not to be found, but in their room the three following Lines, omitted by *Lauder*, have a Place,

Quod si Acies, fractasque iterum supplere catervas
Est animus, sciteque malas dispergere fraudes
Non ego consilii, armorum non inutilis Author.

In

In Opposition to this Fact, *Lauder* can possibly urge nothing but the Difference of Editions.—If, therefore, he hath an Edition of *Fletcher*, in which the two disputed Lines have a Place, he is *now* called upon to produce it. But that this is not in his Power, seemeth pretty evident from the following Circumstance. Upon looking into his Table of the Dates of his Authors, at the beginning of his Essay, I find him give such a Description of the Edition of *Phineas Fletcher* which he appealeth to, as is a Demonstration that he never had a Copy of that Book in his Possession. For he cannot tell us either *when* or *where* it was printed, but contenteth himself with mentioning that its Date is *circa* 1640. So that, for any thing that appeareth to the contrary, *Lauder* knoweth nothing of any Edition of the *Locustæ* different from that to which I appeal. Or grant that he hath seen another Edition, yet still how unlikely is it that two Editions of the same Work should differ so much? And will not every one, already acquainted with our Critic's Interpolations in other Authors, think himself sufficiently warranted to conclude, *that the two Lines now in Dispute have also been*
inter-

*interpolated by him, in order to bring in Milton guilty of plundering Fletcher? **

But if *Lauder* may possibly produce an Edition of *Phineas Fletcher* in which the Lines that I suppose to be *forged*, have a Place (which yet I am confident he cannot do) his *Forgery* in the Instance which I now proceed to take Notice of, will be so fully proved, as to leave him no room for Evasion, no pretence of Cavil.

From the *Comædia Apocalyptica* of *John Fox*, entitled, *Christus triumphans*, he asserteth that *Milton* hath borrowed what he calleth *that quaint and ridiculous Emblem of giving*

* I was so struck with the Likeness of

In promptu causa est : super est invicta voluntas,
Immortale odium, vindictæ & sæva cupido,

to *Milton's*

—————unconquerable Will
And study of Revenge, immortal Hate,

that, knowing of what Service *Hog* had been to our Critic in other Places, I thought he might have been indebted to him *here*. But it seems *Lauder* did not think the Resemblance would have been striking enough had he adopted *Hog's* Translation, and, therefore, he has given us a much closer Translation of *Milton's* Lines, of his own. However, that he has borrowed something from *Hog* seems pretty evident. For *Hog's* Translation of the Lines in question is

—————Voluntas
Libera durat adhuc studiumque immane nocendi
Immortale odium, & nunquam desistere certum. *Hog*, p. 5.

up

up the Ghost, covered with the Cowl of St. Francis*; and in support of his Charge, he quoteth the following Passage, as to be met with in Fox;

Tu, Psychephone!
Hypocritis esto; hoc sub Francisci pallio,
Quo tuto tecti sese credunt emori.

Now, my Lord, upon turning to the *Comædia Apocalyptica*, it appeareth that there is no such Line as that which I have put in *Italics*, and which *Lauder* hath interpolated in order to induce us to believe that *Milton* borrowed the following Passage from Fox,

And they who to be sure of Paradise,
Dying put on the Weeds of *Dominic*,
Or in *Franciscan* think to pass disguised †.

Lauder appealeth to an Edition of the *Christus Triumphans*, printed at *Basil*, 1556, and no doubt he flattered himself a Book of so old a Date would be difficult to be met with in order to convict him of having corrupted its Text. But, unfortunately for him, the very Edition to which he appealeth, is in the *Bodleian Library*. Upon Examination, indeed, it appeareth that this Copy wanteth the Title Page; but as it is registered in the Catalogue as printed at *Basil*, 1556, this is

* *Lauder*, p. 115. † *Paradise Lost*, B. 3.—478.

a sufficient Proof of its being the very Edition referred to by *Lauder*. Besides this old Edition, there is another in the same Library, bearing Date *London* 1672, and a third I have in my own Possession printed at *London* 1676, both which, as we learn from their Title Pages, are Copies of the *Basil* Edition of 1556; and all *three* agree in reading the Passage in question in this Manner,

Tu Psychepone
Hypocrisis esto, hoc sub Francisci Pallio.
Tu Thanate, Martyromastix re & nomine fies *.

Observe then how many Frauds our honest Critic was obliged to have Recourse to, before he could introduce the interpolated Line,

Quo tuto tecti sese credunt emori.

He putteth a Comma after *Tu*, and a Note of Admiration after *Psychephone*; the Comma after *esto* he changeth into a Semicolon, and the full Stop after *pallio* he converteth into a Comma. And yet, after all this, he can scarcely connect the *interpolated* Line with the Context so as to make Sense of it; and the Change of Person in it, *tecti credunt*, which is quite inconsistent with the Con-

* Christus Triumphans, Act 5. Scene 1.

text, sheweth that our Critic hath not *forged* here with necessary Precaution.

It may not be improper just to add as another Specimen of *Lauder's* Ingenuity, that he hath *forged* once more, in order to make good his Charge that the *Death and Sin* of the *Paradise Lost* are borrowed from the *Christus Triumphans* of *John Fox*.—Upon examining the *Dramatis Personæ* of this odd Piece, the only two Characters, which I can find there, bearing a Resemblance to *Milton's* *Death and Sin*, are *Thanatus* and *Psycephbonus*. But as, unluckily, both those Names are Masculine in *Fox*, in order to make one of them similar to *Milton's* female Character of *Sin*, our Critic hath thought it proper to make a small Alteration, and to transform *Psycephbonus* into *Psycephbone* *.

After having assigned so many *extraordinary* Instances of *Forgery*, your *Lordship* would scarcely imagine that there can be an *Instance* more extraordinary than all the rest, still unmentioned. And yet that there is, you and all the World will readily grant when

* This is evident from his Translation of the Passage from *Fox*, in his Essay, p. 116. Which is as follows,

Psycephbone, be thou Hypocrisy, &c.

I assert, that not contented with having *forged* Lines for *Staphoristus*, *Fox*, *Taubmannus*, *Fletcher*, &c. our enterprizing Critic hath *forged* Lines for *Milton* himself, and interpolateth into the *Paradise Lost* a Passage which is not to be found. However ridiculously improbable this may seem, I think I may pronounce the *Fact* to be certain.

Lauder, so long ago as the Year 1747, made his Appearance as the *Zoilus* of *Milton*, in the *Gentleman's Magazine*. In the *Magazine* for *February* of that Year *, he obligeth the World with the first Act of *Grotius's Adamus exsul*, and marketh at the bottom of the Pages, the Passages of *Milton* which he would have us believe stolen from *Grotius*.—In this Act of the *Adamus exsul* the two following Lines are to be met with,

Lacusque vivi sulphuris semper fluunt
Et ampla vacuo spatia laxantur loco;

and as a Proof that *Milton* had copied them, he quoteth the following Passage as his, and which indeed beareth a very great Similitude to *Grotius's Latin*.

And Lakes of living Sulphur ever flow,
And ample Space:—

* Page 84.

I 2

Now

Now, *my Lord*, after having examined the *Paradise Lost* with the greatest Care, not only by the Help of Dr. *Newton's* copious verbal Index, but also by turning over every Page of the Poem, I think myself sufficiently well authorized to pronounce that the Line and half, just mentioned, have no Existence in the *Paradise Lost*, but have been forged by our Critic, who justly might think that there could be no greater Crime in accommodating the Text of *Milton* to *Grotius*, than there was in accommodating that of *Staphorsius*, &c. to the *Paradise Lost*. And as the Crime was not greater, so, perhaps, he flattered himself the Danger of Detection might be less, and that he might safely interpolate Lines in *Milton*; because the Impudence of the Attempt is such, that the World taking the Impossibility of the Thing for granted, might perhaps in this Case be more easily imposed upon.—Tho' I may have gone beyond the Plan, I proposed to myself, a Detection of the gross Impositions contained in our Critic's *Essay*, yet I thought it extremely proper to take Notice of this Piece of Forgery obtruded upon the Public in the *Magazine*, because I could not take a more effectual Way to convince them that the Charge which I have brought against *Lauder* of corrupting
the

the Texts of the obscure *Latin* Writers abovementioned, is credible, than by satisfying them that he actually hath offered such an Affront to their Understanding, as to corrupt the Text of the *Paradise Lost*.—If he could venture to forge Lines for *Milton*, who will wonder that he should do this for *Staphorstius*, *Fletcher*, *Taubman* and *Fox*?

From the Instances that I have assigned, from the Facts to which I have appealed, I think, my Lord, there resulteth this Conclusion, That the Critic of *Milton* having been detected of *forgery* in several of the Authors whom he quoteth, Copies of which we have been so lucky as to meet with, we may, without doing him any Injustice, suspect that he hath used the same Freedoms with regard to *Masenius* and the *Adamus Exsul* of *Grotius*, the two main Champions of his Cause, but *invisible* to all the World but himself. It resteth upon him to shew that this Suspicion is groundless, and that the old printed Copies of these two Pieces correspond exactly with the Account that he giveth of them, and contain all those Lines which he quoteth as from them. And how can he do this in a satisfactory Manner? A new Edition of these Authors printed under his own Inspection

tion will not do. He who could quote *old Editions* of Books, for Lines which have been proved to have no Existence there, will make no Scruple to interpolate Lines in his *new Editions*, in order to put the Charge of Plagiarism, which he bringeth against *Milton*, upon Record. We do not in the least doubt of Mr. *Lauder's* being able to accommodate *Masenius*, or the *Adamus Exsul* to the Text of the *Paradise Lost* (for his Skill this way hath been observed in repeated Instances) and, therefore, he must not only publish new Editions, but also produce the old ones from which they were taken. These he must deposit with his Bookseller, or in some public Library: If this be not done he doth nothing, and this, I am satisfied, he dareth not do, without putting it in our Power to detect him in *Forgeries* as gross as those of which he already standeth convicted. That it may not be thought that I assert without proving, or suspect without just Foundation of Suspicion, permit me now, *my Lord*, to give my Reasons for being of Opinion that *Lauder* cannot produce a *Masenius*, without satisfying the World, at the same Time, that he hath basely *interpolated*, and changed the Text of this Author.

“ *Milton*, saith *Lauder* *, as one Confe-
 “ quence of the Fall introduceth the Beasts
 “ at Variance one with another, and all of
 “ them together at Variance with Man,”

Beast now with beast 'gan war, and fowl with fowl,
 And fish with fish: to graze the herb all leaving
 Devour'd each other: nor stood much in awe
 Of Man, but fled him, or with countenance grim
 Glar'd on him passing †.

“ These Lines (he addeth) are literally
 “ translated from the following ones of
 “ *Masenius*,”

Quadrupedi pugnant quadrupes, volucrique volucris
 Et piscis cum pisce ferox hostilibus armis
 Prælia sæva gerit: jam pristina pabula spernunt
 Jam tondere piget viridantes gramine campos.
 Alterum & alterius vivunt animalia letho.
 Prisca nec in gentem humanam reverentia durat,
 Sed fugiunt, vel si steterant, fera bella minantur
 Fronte truci torvosque oculos jaculantur in illam.

Nothing certainly can be more striking
 than the Resemblance between the Lines
 quoted from the *Paradise Lost*, and the Eight
Latin Lines quoted as from *Masenius*, and
 whoever compareth them together, will be
 unavoidably led to this Conclusion that
 the *one* is a Translation of the *other*. Our
 Critic would have us believe that the *English*
 Lines are the Translation; and would prove

* *Lauder's Essay*, p. 42. † *Paradise Lost*, B. 10.—710.

this unexceptionably, if the Eight Lines in Question have really a Place in an Edition of *Masenius*, printed at *Cologne*, 1654, to which Edition he appealeth.—But that there are no such Lines in *Masenius*, seemeth pretty certain from this Fact—*that they have a Place in * Hog's Translation of the Paradise Lost, and are his Paraphrase of those very Lines which Lauder will have to be literally translated from Masenius.*—It was the striking Resemblance between the *English* and *Latin* Lines that gave Occasion to this Discovery, For as the *Forgeries* of which our Critic had been detected rendered every thing suspected that had passed thro' his Hands, and as the Eight Lines on the War of the Beasts appeared to be as close a Translation of *Milton*, as the Eight Lines interpolated in *Staphorsius* on Marriage, this furnished a Conjecture that *Lauder* had both these Passages from the same Source; and this Conjecture appeared to be a *Certainty*, when *Hog* was examined.

It may, perhaps, be urged that, even tho' the Lines in Dispute be in *Hog*, this is no Proof that they were not *originally* in *Masenius*; our Critic may perhaps allege, that as the *Latin* Translation of *Milton* did not

* *Hog*, Page 223.

appear till between thirty and forty Years after *Masenius's* Poem, *Hog* finding these Lines already in *Masenius* might adopt them as his own, as he could not translate this Passage of the *Paradise Lost* more closely.—The Possibility of this must be granted, but the Improbability of it must, at the same time, be asserted; and it resteth upon our Critic to satisfy the World that this is indeed the Case.

But as we have already convicted him of so many *Forgeries*, as the same Plea may be urged with regard to *Staphoristus* who wrote long before *Hog* translated *Milton*, and as it is certain that the Lines interpolated from the *Latin* Translator of *Milton*, never had a Place in the Work of the *Dutch Divine*; who will be so *unreasonably* candid as to suppose that the Eight Lines in Question ever had a Place in the Work of the *Jesuit*?

But, besides this *extraordinary Fact*, I have other Reasons sufficient to warrant my Assertion that our Critic cannot produce a *printed Copy* of *Masenius* agreeable to the Account with which he presenteth us, of that Poem, in his *Essay*.—And here, *my Lord*, I must once more bring in the *Magazine* as Evidence against him; and if it shall appear that he

K hath

hath grossly contradicted himself, and that the Account given by him of *Masenius* in the *periodical Collection*, differeth very *essentially* from that given by him in his more studied Production, the *Essay*; then, I think, there can be no room for doubting that he dareth not venture to produce a printed Copy of *Masenius* without enabling us to point out Articles interpolated by him in that Author, which never had any Existence in his Work.

In the *Gentleman's Magazine* for *January*, 1747, *Lauder* publisheth the Marginal Heads of *Masenius* for the same Purpose he hath done in his *Essay*, in order to induce us to believe that *Milton's* Plan is borrowed from the *Jesuit's*. Now, my Lord, I have compared the Marginal Heads as given us by him at these two different times, and I find a great many Articles which were published as part of them, in the Magazine, omitted in the Catalogue of them enumerated in the *Essay*, a Catalogue, in other Respects, more perfect and complete than the other. To void entering into an unnecessary Detail of Particulars, suffer me to mention two very important Heads represented as part of *Masenius*

Masenius in the Magazine, which are not to be met with in the Essay. These are the *Gigantomachia*, and *Prophanatio vetiti pomiper Serpentem*.—The first of these Heads naturally suggesteth to the Reader *Milton's Fight of the Angels*, as copied from *Masenius*, and the second is mentioned to induce us to believe that, in the following Passage, *Milton* was also indebted to him :

—————Perhaps the Fact
Is not so heinous now, foretasted Fruit
Prophan'd first by the Serpent——*.

As therefore *Lauder* obtruded upon the Public these two Articles as existing in *Masenius*, and afterwards when he giveth us a more *studied Epitome* of his Poem omitteth them, is there not all the Reason in the World to conclude, that the Marginal Heads of that Author's Work have undergone his skilful *Revision*, in order to be better accommodated to *Milton's* Plan, and that the *Pandæmonium*, which still standeth in the Essay, hath no more an Existence in *Masenius*, than have the other two Articles which *Lauder* hath thought proper to *retract*?

* *Paradise Lost*, B. ix.—929.

I shall only add, that there seemeth sufficient Reason for believing that *Lauder* hath it not in his Power to produce a printed Copy of *Masenius*, even tho' he had no Reason to dread the consequences of doing so.—In the same Collection *, already referred to, he telleth us that *he had unfortunately lost the Performance of this learned Jesuit*; and altho' afterwards † we are told in two Letters dated from *Louvain*, inserted, I suppose, by *Lauder*, that a Copy of *Masenius* was discovered in the *Jesuit's* Library at that Place; yet that our Critic hath any thing more than a Transcript from that Copy (if such Copy doth exist at all) seemeth very improbable, not only because Books, in Libraries of that kind, cannot be parted with, but also, from this Circumstance, that, as far as I can hear, no Body ever hath been favored with a Sight of Mr. *Lauder's Masenius*, but, on the contrary, he himself pretended to Dr. *Newton*, the very first time he waited on the Doctor, that *he had dropt the Book somewhere, and lost it as he was coming to him.*

* *Gentleman's Magazine* for January 1747, p. 25.

† ————— Do. p. 485, and 567.

But

But if our Critic should be able to produce a printed *Masenius*, this are we certain of, *my Lord*, from his own Confession, that he cannot produce a printed Copy of the *Adamus Exsul*. For he telleth us, “ that this “ Tragedy, tho’ it had passed thro’ no “ less than four Editions——was become “ so very scarce that he could not procure a Copy either in *Britain* or *Holland*, “ ’till the learned Mr. *Abrabam Gronovius*, “ Keeper of the public Library at *Leyden*, “ after great Enquiry, obtained a Sight of “ one, and sent him (transcribed by his “ own Son) the first Act of it, and afterwards the rest *”. So that it appeareth that all the Passages of *Grotius’s* Tragedy which seem to have been imitated by *Milton* are taken from a MS. which, according to our Critic’s own Account, cannot be collated with a printed Copy. What Security therefore can the World have, that the Lines quoted by him as from the *Adamus Exsul*, and which bear so striking a Resemblance to Passages in the *Paradise Lost*, really exist in the MS. sent over by *Gronovius* (if, after so many glaring Impostures proved upon *Lauder*, he is to be believed when he says that *Gronovius* did

* *Lauder*, p. 49, 50.

send the MS.) what Security, I say, can the World have, that the MS. hath not been *interpolated* in the same Manner that printed Books have been by him, in order to make it fit to be produced in Evidence against *Milton*? Surely, after having been convicted of having corrupted the Text not only of his *antiquated Versifiers*, but also of *Milton* himself, in order to make good his Charge, our Critic cannot have the Assurance to expect, that any Regard will be paid to an Edition of the *Adamas Exsul* printed from a MS. which no body hath seen but himself—a MS. which he may have *new modelled* without Danger of Detection—a MS. in short, which, *for aught we know*, hath an equal Existence; and which we *certainly know* hath an equal Authority, with the famous MSS. of the impudent *Varillas* †.

But, *my Lord*, there is not only a strong *Presumption*, but even a *Certainty* that *Lauder* hath falsify'd, and new modelled the MS. of the *Adamus Exsul*. He himself hath furnished us with this *important* Discovery; and, therefore, if in no other Instances, at least in this, the Public is under Obligations to him. This hath been *discovered* by

† See Bishop *Burnet's* Reflexions on *Varillas's* History of Heresies.

collating the Quotations which he maketh from the Tragedy of *Grotius*, in the *Magazine*, with those which he presenteth us in his Essay. Two Instances of this will be sufficient to establish the Truth of the Charge. — In the *Magazine* † he quoteth this Line as in *Grotius*,

Tibi nam relicta, quo vadam?

now upon turning to his Essay ‡ we find him quote the same Line with a remarkable variation,

Tibi nam relicta, quo petam?

But if he should allege that this Change of a Word is too trifling to be insisted on, and hath arisen from *Mistake*, the same Plea will not serve him in the other Instance, where the Variation is too great not to be looked upon as arising from *Premeditation*. — In the *Magazine* § he hath this Line as from *Grotius*,

Quidni? quum gravior orcus sub pedibus tremit.

but when we look to his *Essay*, we meet with a strange Transformation, and read

Quid dico? Tellus? Orcus & pedibus tremit.

† For 1747, p. 286.

‡ Page 66.

§ For 1747, p. 83.

And

And now what Doubt can there remain of our Critic's having made *Grotius's* MS. undergo the same skilful Revision, which even printed Books could not escape from his *interpolating* Pen?

After all, *my Lord*, tho' our Critic should even be able to convince the World that the Quotations from *Masenius* and *Grotius*, which bear so great a Resemblance to Passages in the *Paradise Lost*, really have a Place in these Authors (tho' the contrary seemeth to be certain); yet this will be far from blasting *Milton's* Laurels, nor will it warrant his being stiled *not inferior to the most unlicensed Plagiary that ever wrote* †.—But I would willingly ask this bold Man a few Questions. If *Milton* really did borrow so much from *Masenius* and *Grotius*, why should he have Recourse to Forgeries, to prove that he borrowed from *Staphorstius*, *Taubmannus*, *Fletcher*, *Fox*, and *Heywood*? If he could have supported his Charge of Plagiarism, by alleging unexceptionable Facts, why hath he called into his Assistance the basest of Frauds? I have proved incontrovertably, that he hath forged in several Instances,—and doth not such a Conduct imply a Consciousness, that Truth was

† *Lauder's* Essay, p. 163.

to be violated before he could have a sufficient Foundation for his Accusation? Besides, even supposing that he could have made good his Charge, without deviating from Truth and Justice; supposing that many of the Passages which he quoteth were really imitated by *Milton*; yet how can he ever dare to set up his Face again as a *Writer*, I had almost said as an *honest Man*, when we see that he is guilty of the vilest of Arts to strengthen his Cause? — If he could have established the Point that he laboreth so much, by fair Means, the more inexcusable must he appear, for having called in *Forgery* to his Aid. I can compare his Conduct to nothing else but to that of a Man, who, tho' he had it in his Power to produce *authentic Deeds* to prove his Title to an Estate, should rather chuse to rest the Merits of his Cause on *forged ones*.

About a Year hath now elapsed since Mr. *Lauder's* Criticisms, before scattered in the above-mentioned Monthly Paper, have been collected together, and formed into an *Octavo Volume*. The Admirers of the *Paradise Lost* have not been entirely silent: Many anonymous detached Pieces, in its Defence,

L

have

have made their Way into the World. But the Authors of them have had this Difficulty to struggle with — they have taken it for granted, that the Facts, on which the Critic of *Paradise Lost* buildeth his Charge, are truly stated. This hath given him some Degree of Merit in the Eyes of Men of Learning — this hath procured to him, as I hear, the Countenance of the *Great*; and encouraged him to open a Subscription for the Publication of a new Edition of some of those Authors, who, according to him, have held out the Torch to *Milton*. Were, therefore, *my Lord*, the Instances of his shameful Impositions on the World but once known, an End would be put to the Triumphs of a Man, who seemeth to take a malicious Pleasure in depreciating the Merits of a Poet, whose Genius doth Honor to his Country. And this I can affirm, that his Triumphs would have ceased long ago, had not some Gentlemen, furnished with sufficient Materials to detect his gross Frauds, been restrained from publishing against him, partly thro' *Contempt*, and partly thro' *Compassion*. — *Compassion* for one, who, perhaps, hath a Dependence on the Success of his Work for his Subsistence; *Contempt* for an Attack on the Prince of Eng-
lish

lish Poets, as unavailing as *Priam's* feeble Dart, when thrown at *Pyrrhus*.—However, I think that neither of these Motives should prevail so far, as that the Public should not be undeceived.—*Contempt* is what all Criticisms, really unanswerable, are affected to be treated with; and I should be very sorry that the *Critic of Milton*, and his Admirers (if he hath any) should be allowed to think, that this is the Case of a Criticism on the *Paradise Lost*. *Compassion*, I also think, should be out of the Case here. There is something so invidious in our Author's Scheme, he prosecuteth it with such a Spirit of Rancor and Malice, he appeareth so well pleased to rob his Country of the Glory of having a Poem equal at least, if not superior to the noblest Productions of Antiquity; and, which is chiefly to be considered, he hath Recourse to such *vile Arts*, such *glaring Impostures*, in the Prosecution of his Design, that it is the Duty of every one, who hath had Opportunities of detecting him, to expose him to public Censure, to *brand* him with that Infamy which he deserveth, and to rescue from his shameful Misrepresentations the Character of a Person, whose Errors, as a *Politician*, seem to determine *some*

to deny him his just Praise as a *Poet*; and whose *Paradise Lost* must be run down, merely because penned by the Author of the *Defensio Populi Anglicani*.—It is to be hoped, nay it is *expected*, that the elegant and nervous Writer, whose judicious Sentiments, and inimitable Stile, point out the Author of *Lauder's* Preface and Postscript, will no longer allow one to *plume himself with his Feathers*, who appeareth so little to have deserved his Assistance; an Assistance which, I am persuaded, would never have been communicated, had there been the least Suspicion of those Facts, which I have been the Instrument of conveying to the World in these Sheets; a Perusal of which will satisfy our Critic, who was pleased to submit his Book to the Judgment of the two *Universities*, that it hath been examined, and *carefully* read, at least, by some Members of the *University of Oxford*.

Before I conclude, suffer me, *my Lord*, only to offer one Conjecture, which, as it is in *Lauder's* Favor, ought not to be omitted.—I am sometimes inclined to think, that if our Critic would be so ingenuous as to communicate to the World, *who* were his Auxiliaries

iliaries in the Attack on *Milton*, it would perhaps appear that he himself hath been imposed upon; that the *Forgeries* are not his own, but that Persons noted for *Forgeries* in other Instances have been the principal Contrivers of these. That the *Jesuits* at *Louvain* were his Correspondents, seemeth evident from the Magazines referred to above.— Now, *my Lord*, I look upon it to be extremely probable, that Men, the avowed Principles of whose *Order* allow of the greatest of Frauds; who, by their *Distinctions*, *mental Reservations*, *Casuistical Quibbles*, and *probable Doctrines*, can give a Merit to the blackest Designs: I say, I look upon it as extremely probable, that such Persons should not scruple to have Recourse to the vilest Arts to depreciate the Fame of *Milton*:— *Milton*, whose generous and manly Notions, with regard to Religion, they could not digest—and whom they never could forgive, for having so successfully, in many Places of his Works, exposed the Corruptions of the Sons of the frantic *Loyola*.—And, therefore, I would fain hope, that Mr. *Lauder*, if he would preserve his Character as an honest Man, will fairly confess that he hath been imposed upon by such *Correspondents*, and re-
sign

sign to them the Honor that he hath hitherto
 claimed to himself, of being the Discoverer
 of *Milton's* Imitations of the Moderns; a
 Discovery effected by the laudable Art of
FORGERY.

I am,

MY LORD, &c. &c.



POSTSCRIPT.

May 17th, 1756.

THE Demand for the above *Letter*, having induced the Bookseller to reprint it, I have thought that I should make this *new Edition* of it, more acceptable to the Reader, by giving some Account of the Consequences which its first Publication, in 1750, produced: Consequences as honorable, with regard to the *Poetical Fame* of *Milton*, as they were disgraceful with regard to the Moral Character of his Critic.

The Charge of *Forgery* had been urged by me against *Lauder*, with such Circumstances, that there was no Way left of invalidating it, but by his shewing that there was a Variation between the several Editions of those Books from which he had selected his Authorities, and the Editions of the same Books which had been consulted in the *Bodleian Library*.

*

Tho'

Tho' such a Variation could scarcely be supposed possible, the Booksellers who had published his *Essay*, willing to do every thing in their Power to satisfy the World that they had been imposed upon, immediately called upon him to make his Defence; and his Behavior upon that Occasion cannot be better expressed than in their own Words, which I have transcribed from the Apology for themselves, which they published.

“ An immediate Application to *Lauder*
 “ was necessary as well to justify ourselves,
 “ as to remove or confirm the Charge.
 “ Accordingly we acquainted him that if he
 “ did not instantly put into our Hands the
 “ Books from which he had taken the principal Passages—, we would publicly
 “ disclaim all Connexion with him, and expose his declining the only Step left for
 “ his Defence. This Declaration brought
 “ him to us the following Day, when, with
 “ great Confidence, he acknowledged the *Interpolation* of all the Books—and seemed
 “ to wonder at the Folly of Mankind, in
 “ making such an extraordinary Rout about
 “ eighteen or twenty Lines. As this Man
 “ then, has been guilty of such a wicked
 “ Imposi-

“ Imposition upon us, our Friends, and the
 “ Public, and is capable of so daring an
 “ Avowal of it, we declare that we will
 “ have no farther Intercourse with him,
 “ and that we now sell his Book only as a
 “ *Curiosity of Fraud and Interpolation*, which
 “ all the Ages of Literature cannot parallel.

London, Decemb. 1.

“ JOHN PAYNE.

1750.

“ JOSEPH BOUQUET.”

Disclaimed thus by his Bookfellers, *Lauder*
 found no Protection from his Friends. For
 no sooner was the Scene of Abuse and Inter-
 polation disclosed, than the same laudable
 Motives which had induced some Gentle-
 men, well known to the learned World, to
 assist our Critic in the Publication of his
 Book, induced them to do every thing in
 their Power to forward a complete Detec-
 tion of all his Impostures. To the Advice
 and Influence of One Gentleman in particu-
 lar, the Touches of whose masterly Pen, as I
 observed *, *point out the Author of Lauder's*
Preface and Postscript, the World is princi-
 pally indebted, for the unreserved Confes-
 sion which this *extraordinary* Man made, in
 † *a Letter to the Reverend Mr. Douglas, oc-*
casioned by his Vindication of Milton.

* See P. 77. † Printed for *W. Owen* at *Homer's Head*, 1751.

In this Address to his Antagonist, *Lauder* consented to express himself as followeth :

“ The Civility with which you have
 “ treated me, when you had contestable Su-
 “ periority, hath inclined me to make your
 “ Victory complete without any farther
 “ Struggle, and not only *publickly to acknow-*
 “ *ledge* the Truth of the Charge which you
 “ have hitherto advanced, but to confess,
 “ without the least Diffimulation, Subter-
 “ fuge or Concealment, *every other* Interpo-
 “ lation I have made in those Authors which
 “ you have not yet had Opportunity to ex-
 “ amine.—On the Sincerity and Punctuali-
 “ ty of this Confession, I am willing to de-
 “ pend for all the future Regard of Man-
 “ kind, and cannot but indulge some Hopes,
 “ that they whom my Offence hath alienat-
 “ ed from me, may by this Instance of In-
 “ genuity and Repentance, be propitiated
 “ and reconciled. — Whatever may be
 “ the Event, I shall, at least, have done all
 “ that can be done in Reparation of my
 “ former Injuries to *Milton*, to Truth and
 “ to Mankind, and entreat that those who
 “ shall continue implacable, will examine
 “ their own Hearts, whether they have not
 “ committed equal Crimes without equal
 “ Proofs

“ Proofs of Sorrow, or equal Acts of Atone-
 “ ment.—For the Violation of Truth I of-
 “ fer no Excuse, because I well know that
 “ nothing can excuse it. Nor will I aggra-
 “ vate my Crime by disingenuous Palliati-
 “ ons. I confess it, I repent it, and resolve
 “ that my first Offence shall be my last.
 “ More I cannot perform, and more, there-
 “ fore, cannot be required. I intreat the
 “ Pardon of all Men, whom I have by any
 “ Means induced to support, to counte-
 “ nance, or patronize my Frauds, of which
 “ I think myself obliged to declare that *not*
 “ *one of my Friends* was conscious. I hope to
 “ deserve by better Conduct, and more use-
 “ ful Undertakings, that Patronage which
 “ I have obtained from the most illustrious
 “ and venerable Names, by Misrepresenta-
 “ tion and Delusion, and to appear here-
 “ after in such a Character as shall give you
 “ no Reason to regret that your Name is
 “ frequently mentioned with that of,

“ Reverend, SIR,

Decemb. 29, 1750. “ Yours, &c. &c.

“ WILLIAM LAUDER.

It would be unnecessary to transcribe, at full Length, the List which *Lauder* hath given us of all his Interpolations, in the Pamphlet from which I have transcribed the foregoing Quotation; because great Part of them have been already placed before the Reader, in the above Detection. So that if I confine myself to the Interpolations which he confesseth to have made in the *Authors whom I had not an Opportunity to examine*, this will give us a full and complete View of all the *Forgeries* of this strange Impostor.

In the 117th Page of his Essay, he had given us a Quotation from the Tragedies of *Johannes Franciscus Quintianus*; one Line of which,

Summos dolores maximisque gaudiis,

is all *His own*; by which Addition to the Text of his Author, and by altering another Line

Mutare facile est pondus immensum levi

to *mutare volupe est*, &c.; he hath been able to make out a Resemblance between *Quintianus*, and the following Passage of *Milton*:

———where thou might'st hope to change
Torment with Ease, and soonest recompence
Dole with Delight.———

P. L. B. 4. L. 892.

The

The *Latin* Translation of *Theodore Beza's* *Abrahamus sacrificans* hath also undergone his Correction. For he hath confessed, that, in a Speech of *Satan*, quoted by him, P. 119, from that Tragedy, he hath interpolated this Line,

Quasi exuisssem omnem malitiam ex pectore,

by which Means he hoped to be able to convince his Readers that *Milton* had borrowed from *Beza*, the following Passage ;

That Space the evil One abstracted stood
From his own Evil. P. L. B. 9. L. 463.

In the 88th Page of his Essay, we meet with a very extraordinary Interpolation. There he hath quoted, as from *Ramsay*, a *Scotch* Poet,

Pallentes umbras Erebi noctemque profundam.

a Line, which never existed but in *Virgil*. Upon my asking him his Reason for being guilty of so unnecessary a Piece of Fraud, he made no other Apology, but that he thought the Insertion of this Line would be a great Improvement to the Text of *Ramsay*. Like an abandoned Pick-pocket he cannot abstain from his Infamous Occupation, even when there can be no Temptation to exercise it.

But

But if his *Lauder* hath been sparing of Interpolations in *Ramsay*, *Beza*, and *Quintianus*, he hath made ample Amends for his Neglect of them, by the effectual Assistance which he hath obliged *Masenius* and *Grotius* to lend. Having pitched upon the *Sarcotis* of the former, and the *Adamus Exsul* of the latter, invisible to every Body in *England* but himself, to be the main Pillars of his Cause, he hath wisely taken Care to make them both speak to his Purpose; and the following Summary of his Confession, with regard to these two Authors, while it sheweth that almost every Quotation from them, throughout his Essay, is spurious, will at the same Time satisfy the Reader that he had both Judgment to contrive, and Learning to execute, a Series of *Forgeries* extremely well calculated to answer his villainous Intent. Let us, first, see what have been his honest Evidences of *Masenius*.

I. To prove that *Milton* stole his *Pandæmonium* from the *Jesuit*, our Critic had quoted this Word, P. 10, as from the marginal Heads of the 1st Book of the *Sarcotis*. Without being able to see a Copy of this Poem, I had mentioned * my Reasons for suspecting

* See P. 68, 69.

that

that no such Word existed there. These Suspicions are now confirmed by *Lauder's* own Confession.

II. He hath admitted that the *Eight Lines* on the War of the Beasts, which I had shewn * to be in *Hog's* Translation, never existed in any *Masenius* but his own.

III. P. 38, of his Essay, he hath interpolated this Line,

Angeli hoc efficiunt, celestia jussa secuti,

by the Addition of which to *Masenius's* Description of the Universe in Disorder, he thought to make out a Likeness between this, and a similar Description in the *Paradise Lost*, where we read,

Some say he bid his Angels turn ascanse

The Poles of Earth.

P. L. B. 10. L. 668.

IV. P. 41. Amongst many other Lines quoted from *Masenius* he hath inserted one of his own,

Infernique canes populantur cuncta creata,

which is a Translation from

See with what Heat these Dogs of Hell advance

To waste and havock yonder World.

P. L. B. 10. L. 616.

* See P. 66.

V.

V. P. 43, we meet with another Forgery,

Vatibus antiquis numerantur lumine cassis,
Tiresias, Phineus, Thamyrisque & magnus Homerus.

an Improvement upon * *Masenius* to make
out a strong Resemblance between him and
Milton's

Blind Thamyris and blind Meonidas,
And Tiresias and Phineus, Prophets old.
P. L. B. 3. L. 35.

VI. *Milton* having described *Satan* thus ;

———He above the rest,
In Shape and Gesture proudly eminent,
Stood like a Tower.— P. L. B. 1. L. 589.

and soon after, when he speaketh of his
Associates,

———As when Heaven's Fire
Hath scath'd the Forest Oaks, or Mountain Pines.
lb. L. 612.

our Critic, in order to shew that these two
Passages were borrowed from *Masenius*, in a
Quotation from that Author, P. 46, hath
given a Place to the two following Lines
of his own Manufacture,

Perfimilis turri præcessæ, aut montibus altis
Antiquæ cedro, nudatæ frondis honore.

* *Masenius*, if we may believe *Lauder*, hath one Line,
Tiresias cæcus, Thamyrisque, et Daphnis, Homerus.

Having

Having dispatched *Lauder's* judicious E-
mendations of *Masenius*, according to his
own Confession, let us now, upon the same
unexceptionable Authority, give a Cata-
logue of his numerous Interpolations in the
Adamus Exsul of *Grotius*. He hath quot-
ed that Poem only eleven Times, and each
Time hath he been guilty of the most impu-
dent Forgery.

I. P. 58, of his Essay, we meet with this
Line attributed to *Grotius*,

Quid dico? Tellus? Orcus et pedibus tremit.

I had been * able to assign Reasons for sus-
pecting that this Line was spurious; *Lau-*
der's Confession hath it beyond Doubt. The
Source of this Forgery is *Milton's*,

—Hell trembled as he trode.

P. L. B. 2. L. 676.

II. In the same Page we meet with ano-
ther Forgery,

—Nam, me iudice,

Regnare dignum est ambitu, etsi in Tartaro:

Alco præesse Tartaro siquidem juvat,

Coelis quam in ipsis servi obire munia.

* See P. 72, 73.

This Interpolation was made, that *Milton* might be convicted of stealing from *Grotius*, the following remarkable Passage ;

—And, in my Choice,
To reign is worth Ambition, tho' in Hell :
Better to reign in Hell than serve in Heaven.

P. L. B. 1. L. 261.

III. P. 59, *Lauder* hath another Quotation from *Grotius*, the two following Lines of which he hath owned to be spurious ;

Narra petenti, quo modo, quoque ordine,
Tam magna numeris machina impleta est suis.

This Interpolation was intended to prove that *Milton* had borrowed from the *Adamus Exsul*,

Deign to descend now lower, and relate
How first began this Heaven, which we behold
Distant so high ; &c. &c. P. L. B. 7. L. 84.

IV. P. 61, we have another Forgery,

Innominata quæque nominibus suis
Libet vocare propriis vocabulis.

a literal Translation from *Milton's*

Things by their Names I call, tho' yet unnam'd.
P. L. B. 12. L. 140.

V. P. 63, he hath interpolated

Coeli, solique soboles ! ætherium genus !

translated from *Milton's*

Offspring of Heaven and Earth, and all Earth's Lord !

P. L. B. 9. L. 273.

VI. *Milton* having compared the Eyes of the Serpent to Carbuncles ;

— and Carbuncles his Eyes.

P. L. B. 9. L. 500.

this was a sufficient Inducement to *Lauder*, to interpolate, P. 63, in a long Quotation from the *Adamus Exsul*,

Carbunculorum luce certantes rubra.

VII. P. 65, he hath interpolated

— Nata Deo ! atque homine fata !

Regina mundi ! eademque interitus inficia !

Cunctis colenda !

These Lines are his own Translation from *Milton's*

Daughter of God and Man ! immortal Eve ! P. L. B. 9. L. 291.

Empress of this fair World !

Ib. L. 568.

Sovereign of Creatures ! universal Dame !

Ib. L. 612.

VIII. P. 66, Mr. *Lauder's* *Grotius* hath

Rationis etenim omnino paritas exigit,

Ego bruta quando bestia evasi loquens ;

Ex homine, qualis ante, te fieri Deam.

which Lines never existed till this honest Critic translated them from the *Paradise Lost*,

That ye shall be as Gods, since I as Man,
Internal Man, is but proportion meet;
I, of brute, human; ye of human, Gods.

P. L. B. 9. L. 710.

IX. In the same Page he hath interpolated two other Lines, in a Quotation from *Grotius*,

and Cassam, oro, dulci luminis jubare tui:
Tibi nam relicta, quo petam? aut ævum exigam?

by which Means he was able to make out a Resemblance between this Part of the *Adamus Exsul*, and the following Passages from *Milton*;

~~Whereon I live, thy gentle Looks, thy Aid;~~
~~forlorn of thee,~~
Whither shall I betake me? where subsist?

P. L. B. 10. L. 918.

X. P. 67, he hath forged five Lines for *Grotius*,

Tu namque soli numini contrarius,
Minus et nocivus; est ego nocentior,
(Adeoq; n' i'era magis, quippe miseriæ comes
Origoq; scelus est, lurida mater mali!)

Deumque læsi scelere, teque, Vir, simul.

We

We find the Original in *Milton*,

— on me exercise not
Thy Hatred for this Mis'ry befallen;
On me, already lost! me! than thyself
More miserable! Both have sinn'd, but thou
Against God only; I against God and thee.

XI. P. 68, he quoteth from *Grotius*,

Quod comedo, poto, gigno, diris subjacet.

When he observed, that *Arms and the Man*
I sing, is no more a Translation of *Arma*
virumque cano, than *Milton's*

All that I eat, or drink, or shall beget
Is propagated Curse! P. L. B. 10. L. 728.

is a Translation of the above *Latin* Line,
he was not aware that the Time would
come when he should be obliged to con-
fess, that the *Latin* is his own Translation
from the *English*, and that this and Ten
other gross Forgeries were necessary be-
fore he could make out any Resemblance
between the *Paradise Lost*, and the *Adamus*
Exsul.

I should have been glad to leave *Lau-*
der in full Possession of all the Merit which
the *Sincerity and Punctuality* of his *Confes-*
sion could bestow. For the Character of

a Pe-

a Penitent, in which we have last viewed him, if it could not restore him to Fame, might have intitled him to Pity. But his subsequent Conduct deprived him even of this.

He had been sanguin in his Hopes that the unreserved Confession of his Forgeries would more than atone for his having been guilty of them; and that being thus reinstated in the public Favor, his Subscription for a new Edition of the *Sarcotis* of *Masenius*, the *Adamus Exsul* of *Grotius*, and of his other Auxiliaries against *Milton*, would meet with the same Encouragement, which probably it might have met with, if his Interpolations of them had not been detected.

But the Curiosity of the Public to see any of these Poems, was at an End. The only thing which had stamp'd a Value upon them, was the Supposition that *Milton* had thought them worthy of his Imitation. As, therefore, it now appeared by the Detection of *Lauder's* System of Forgery, that *Milton* had not imitated them, it was no wonder that the Design of reprinting them should meet with little or no Success.

Grown

Grown desperate by his Disappointment, this very Man whom, but a little before, we have seen as abject in the Confession of his Forgeries as he had been bold in the Contrivance of them, with an Inconsistence, equalled only by his Impudence, renewed his Attack upon the Author of the *Paradise Lost*; and in a Pamphlet * published for that Purpose, acquainted the World that the *True Reason* which had excited him to contrive his Forgery, was, because *Milton* had attacked the Character of *Charles* the First, by interpolating *Pamela's* Prayer from the *Arcadia*, in an Edition of the *Eikon Basilike*: Hoping, no doubt, by this curious Key to his Conduct, to be received into Favor, if not by the Friends of Truth, at least by the Idolaters of the *Royal Martyr*.

The *ingenious* Gentleman who had advised our Critic to make his Confession, and had even assisted him in drawing it up, having for this Act of Friendship fallen under his Censure, in the Performance just mentioned; and the Zeal of this wild Party-man

* King *Charles* I. vindicated from the Charge of Plagiarism, brought against him by *Milton*; and *Milton* himself convicted, &c. &c.—Printed for *W. Owen* at *Homer's* Head, within *Temple Bar*, 1754.

against

against *Milton* having, at the same time, extended itself against his Biographer the very learned *Dr. Birch*, for no other Reason but because he was so candid as to express his Disbelief of a Tradition unsupported by Evidence; it is not much to be wondered at, that one so criminal as I had been, should also feel the Effects of his Resentment. He who repaired his former Injury to *Milton*, by a fresh and more scurrilous Attack, was capable of rewarding the Civility with which I had treated him, by unprovoked Abuse. But I shall always esteem it as an Honor, rather than lament it as a Misfortune, that I have been attacked from such a Quarter, in such good Company, and for the heinous Offence of having been instrumental in the *Detection of an Impostor*.

JOHN DOUGLAS.

